

THE Nation

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 157

NEW YORK · SATURDAY · AUGUST 21, 1943

NUMBER 8

IN THIS ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS	197
EDITORIALS	
What About China?	199
Some Notes on Harlem	200
ARTICLES	
Pay for Your Own Inflation <i>by Jerome Weinstein</i>	202
10 Years Ago in <i>The Nation</i>	204
"The Beginning of the End" <i>by Donald W. Mitchell</i>	205
Italy and the Pessimists <i>by Louis Graber</i>	206
England Teaches Its Soldiers <i>by Reinhold Niebuhr</i>	208
In the Wind	210
POLITICAL WAR	
The Last Hour <i>by J. Alvarez del Vayo</i>	211
Mr. Hull's Bad Dream <i>by Paul Winkler</i>	212
Behind the Enemy Line <i>by Argus</i>	213
BOOKS AND THE ARTS	
The Preacher Sought to Find Out Acceptable Words <i>A Poem by Richard Eberhart</i>	214
Mr. Moul's "Majority" <i>by Rolfe Humphries</i>	214
The Falange—An Axis Tool <i>by Alexander Uhl</i>	215
The Making of a State <i>by Rustem Vambery</i>	217
Concerning the Peace <i>by Rudolf Flesch</i>	218
Shakespeare's Text <i>by John Berryman</i>	218
Fiction in Review <i>by Diana Trilling</i>	220
Music <i>by B. H. Haggin</i>	221
LETTERS TO THE EDITORS	222
CROSS-WORD PUZZLE <i>by Jack Barrett</i>	224

Editor and Publisher
FRED A. KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor	Washington Editor	Literary Editor
ROBERT BENDINER	I. F. STONE	MARGARET MARSHALL

Editor Political War Section
J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART

Assistant Editor	Music Critic	Drama Critic
J. MITCHELL MORSE	B. H. HAGGIN	JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Board of Contributing Editors
NORMAN ANGELL JONATHAN DANIELS
LOUIS FISCHER REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Business Manager	Advertising Manager
HUGO VAN ARK	MARY HOWARD ELLISON

Published weekly and copyright, 1943, in the U. S. A. by The Nation Associates, Inc., 65 Fifth Ave., New York 3, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 13, 1879, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Washington Editorial Bureau: 807 National Press Building.

The Shape of Things

THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE HAS PRODUCED UP to date a minimum of real news and a maximum of rumor and speculation, mostly centering on the man who isn't there—Joseph Stalin. From London and Washington, as well as Quebec, have come a spate of interpretations of the categorical statement by the official Tass agency that Russian participation in the conference "was not and is not envisaged." One popular explanation is that Soviet attendance was ruled out by concentration on Pacific questions. A directly opposite suggestion is that the chief purpose of the meeting is to find ways and means of satisfying Stalin's demand for delivery of a second front, as per contract. Our own view is that Europe is the *raison d'être* for the conference, although of course in any discussion of global strategy the problems of one theater have to be related to those of every other. Since the last meeting of Roosevelt and Churchill, it is in Europe that the situation has changed radically. The all but completed capture of the Sicilian gateway, the collapse of Mussolini with its psychological repercussions in Germany, the Russian victories, and the defeat of the U-boats—all these events necessitate a revision of the time-table. Southern Italy, at least, now seems likely to fall into our hands in short order, opening the way to new ventures. But such victories in the Mediterranean arena are of little interest to Stalin unless they force the recall of enough German divisions from the east to make possible a decisive victory there this year. We are inclined to think that time is on our side, but from the Russian point of view we have been borrowing that time from the Red Army, and repayment is due. Until that debt is honored it is clear that little headway will be made in reaching an understanding with Russia about vital post-war issues.

✱

THE MORALE OF A CONSCRIPT ARMY IS interdependent with that of the civilian population from which it springs. Thus the unwillingness of Italian soldiers to go on fighting reflects the war-weariness of the Italian people as a whole. Conversely, the determination with which German troops have fought recently in Russia and Sicily indicates that the morale of the German people, while perhaps increasingly brittle, is still some way from

the breaking point. In Italy, Marshal Badoglio, thanks partly to our fumbling of an opportunity, contrived to clamp back the lid on the revolutionary caldron which started to boil over when Mussolini fell. But he has not been able to draw the fires underneath and there are signs that the lid will soon be blown off for keeps. For there is no instrument of coercion to which the Rome government can turn. It has, perforce, been compelled to break up the Fascist Party apparatus in an effort to appease popular feeling. It cannot look to the army to shoot down demonstrators, for the soldiers share too many of the emotions of the mob. However, by stalling the Allies and temporarily restoring "order" Badoglio has gained time, if not for himself, for the Nazis. By all accounts they are digging in along the line of the Po, while in Sicily their rear guard is covering the evacuation of as many men and as much material as possible. When this operation is completed, they will probably abandon southern Italy. Rome will then, perhaps, be more amenable to suggestions of peace, though no longer able to surrender what we need most—control of Lombardy. We shall now have to fight hard for northern Italy. "Anarchy and chaos," which would have impeded the Germans in organizing new defenses, might have served us better.

✱

HOW DID THE STORY GET LAUNCHED THAT Sumner Welles is about to be eased of the burdens of his office? The report appeared simultaneously in the *New York Times*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Washington Times-Herald*, and, with the possible exception of papers subscribing to the *New York Times* news service, nowhere else. The three papers mentioned are all champions of Secretary of State Hull in his long-standing feud with his second in command. Hull himself denied the story of Welles's pending transfer to other duties, but with a degree of circumlocution which left reporters wondering whether there might not be something to it. The net result is that whether or not the State Department is shortly to lose the services of Mr. Welles, his position has already been effectively torpedoed. This achievement has long been a major objective of the Secretary of State, whose repeated injunction to others to keep their eyes on the war has not deflected his own from the interplay of Washington politics. Hull has frequently suggested to his former colleagues in Congress the inadvisability of treating Welles as a policy maker, and ever since his subordinate's advocacy of the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution, relations between the two men have glided from the strained to the impossible. Welles thinks it would be a good idea for Congress to go on record concerning the shape of the peace; Hull fears public debate and thinks the peace should be left to the professionals. The extent of Welles's present eclipse, ironically, is a measure of his growth as a democrat.

ALMOST ANY DAY NOW THE FRENCH WILL become one of our allies. Of course, they have been fighting a long time, have spilled blood for the United Nations on every front and on the seas of both hemispheres—but all that was unofficial. Now they are to be recognized. Britain is ready, the Soviets are eager to the point of irritation, General Eisenhower is reported to regard the move as a military necessity, and even in the State Department voices have been raised in its favor. The formula for recognizing the French Committee of National Liberation is said to have been worked out, and all that remains is for President Roosevelt to give the word. Britain and the United States have been exchanging notes on the subject since July 21, and the delay must already appear to the world as a grudging reluctance to perform a distasteful act. That, in fact, is the more charitable of the prevailing views concerning our procrastination. The other interpretation is that time was necessary to work out a formula with a joker, to wit, recognition of the Committee as a *de facto* government only up to the moment when French troops land on the soil of continental France. After that what? Presumably we would then recognize a military dictatorship under the commander-in-chief of the French forces, namely, General Giraud, or impose Amgot rule on France. Either arrangement would be temporary, lasting only until the holding of a free election. But "temporary" is an elastic word and much can happen while it is being stretched. The prospect of this formula is held out from Algiers rather than Washington, indicating its possible nature as a trial balloon. If that is what it is, it should be exploded with a bang that will be clearly heard in Quebec. ✱

THE LAG IN WAR PRODUCTION THAT HAS been in evidence the last few months has become so serious that it may affect plans now being laid for an intensification of the military effort. Although plane production reached a new high of 7,373 in July, output has fallen far behind schedule. It is clear that the goal of 10,000 planes a month will not be reached this year, and possibly not until well into 1944. A similar lag has afflicted all other branches of war production except shipbuilding, where schedules are being met. Many causes have been cited for this unexpected check on the industrial front. Changes in design, shifts and cancellations of contracts account for some of the delays. There is a belated recognition of failure to take advantage of small-plant facilities for subcontracting. But the principal problem, in the West Coast aircraft factories at least, has been insufficient man-power. During recent months many plants have been losing through the draft, shifts to other jobs, and in other ways as many workers as they have been able to hire. Much of this loss could have been prevented through provision of adequate housing, trans-

part facilities, day nurseries, and special arrangements for women workers. But in the absence of a carefully worked out man-power program, it is probable that some form of "allocation" of labor may become necessary. The Man-power Commission's new order to reclassify men now in 3-A on the basis of occupation rather than dependency is a timely move in this direction.

*

THE AGITATION AGAINST THE DRAFTING OF fathers is particularly unfortunate in view of the acute man-power shortage. As the situation now stands, skilled men by the tens of thousands are being withdrawn from essential war industries to meet selective-service quotas. Except for 4-F's and the young men just turning eighteen, no single or childless married men between eighteen and thirty-eight are to be found in most areas who are not in essential jobs. But hundreds of thousands of young fathers, the cream of our physical manhood, are still to be found playing baseball, barbering, running elevators, or doing other non-essential work. The War Manpower Commission does not want to see all of these young fathers in the army, but it does want them to choose between army service and essential civilian occupations. In the absence of a law providing for the conscription of labor, the selective-service act provides the only machinery available for forcing these men into useful work. Several Senators and Congressmen, led by the isolationist Senator Wheeler, are seeking to upset this man-power program by making family responsibility rather than contribution to the war effort the basis of man-power policy. We do not believe that this effort will succeed. But the publicity given to the statements of individual members of Congress who oppose the drafting of fathers on political grounds serves the purposes of the enemy by unnecessarily confusing young fathers regarding their draft status and thus delaying their shift to war industries, where they are badly needed.

*

PRIME MINISTER MACKENZIE KING BADLY needs any political kudos that can be gleaned from Winston Churchill's visit to Canada, for his Liberal Party is showing many signs of senile decay. On top of a terrific beating in the Ontario provincial elections, it has lost four federal by-elections, two in the West and two in Quebec. In Ontario, it went to the polls with sixty-three out of a total of ninety seats; it emerged with only fourteen. The Conservatives, who have recently sought to widen their appeal by adopting the adjective "Progressive," increased their numbers from twenty-one to thirty-eight. But the real feature of the contest was the advance of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, which raised its poll from 60,000 to 360,000 and its seats from none to thirty-four. With no party securing an absolute majority, it seems that the Conservatives will have to

patch up some kind of coalition with the Liberal remnant. This may provide a forecast of the political line-up after the next federal election. The C. C. F. is already the strongest party in the West and the following it has secured in its first invasion of industrial Ontario suggests that in English-speaking Canada it will soon be in a position to displace the Liberals. It has not yet been able to make any headway in the province of Quebec, but in this Liberal stronghold Mackenzie King's government is under attack by another foe. In Stanstead, Quebec, the by-election victory won by the newly organized Bloc Populaire is regarded by qualified observers as an indication that this nationalist group will prove a very serious contender at the next general election. Thus threatened from two directions, the Liberal Party, which has ruled Canada through so much of its history as a Dominion, may meet the fate which overtook the British Liberals in 1918.

What About China?

IS FAR EASTERN strategy one of the leading subjects on the Quebec conference agenda? Russia's absence from the meeting has led some commentators to give an affirmative answer to this question. But in this case another question is inevitably raised. Have Chinese representatives been invited to share in the discussions, and if not, why not? China's strategic position in the war against Japan—comparable to Russia's position in the war against Germany—would seem to require Chinese participation in planning the grand strategy of the war in the Far East. We assume that China is being carefully posted on developments through its membership in the Pacific War Council and perhaps through unofficial representation at Quebec. But in the determining of strategy, Chiang Kai-shek's voice is not being heard, except possibly indirectly. As the situation now stands, the United Nations war plan in the Far East is an Anglo-Saxon plan. What excuse can there be for this undeniable fact?

In a recent article in the *Reader's Digest* Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the *New York Times*, suggests one possible excuse when he argues that China's potential military contribution to the war against Japan is negligible. China, Mr. Baldwin insists, "has as yet no real army . . . most of her troops are poorly led and incapable of effectively utilizing modern arms." There is, unfortunately, a substratum of fact beneath Mr. Baldwin's contentions. China is potentially a strong military nation, but despite the sacrifices of six years of warfare its power is still largely potential. Nevertheless, Mr. Baldwin overstates his case when he discounts recent Chinese victories and dismisses Chinese military strength as inconsequential. On the few occasions when the Chinese have had adequate air support they have shown an

offensive capacity that should be recognized in planning the future strategy of the war against Japan. Moreover, it is unwise to ignore the remarkable achievements of Chinese guerrillas merely because they are rarely reported in the American press. The Chinese make excellent soldiers. Provide them with air cover and supplies and they are perfectly capable of driving the Japanese into the sea.

It is doubtful whether Washington or London is worried about the military potential of China. A much more likely basis for concern lies in the persistent reports of serious friction and possible open conflict between the Kuomintang and Eighth Route (Communist) armies. The Chungking government has flatly denied that it plans to take forcible action to dissolve China's Communist Party, as was intimated in a recent article by Vladimir Rogoff which appeared in a Moscow magazine and was extensively quoted in the *New York Times*. But Chungking did not deny the allegation which was the central thesis of Rogoff's article, namely that "appeasers," "defeatists," and "capitulators" within the Kuomintang ranks have prevented China from building up an adequate war economy within its borders, thus creating a fatal dependence on supplies from abroad. This charge, like Mr. Baldwin's, is doubtless exaggerated, but the resistance encountered over a period of years by so important a factor in the Chinese war effort as the industrial cooperatives indicates that it contains at least a grain of truth.

On the matter of friction between the Kuomintang and the Communist armies it is very difficult to obtain wholly reliable information. But as Raymond Gram Swing pointed out in one of his broadcasts last week, it is misleading to think of the Chinese Communists as Marxian proletarians. They are essentially agrarian radicals whose domestic policies are characterized chiefly by attempts to introduce democratic practices and a program of land reform. Contrary to the general supposition, the Chinese Communists have chalked up fully as good a record in the war against Japan as the regular army. T. A. Bisson, writing for the American Council of Pacific Relations, points out that the Eighth and Fourth Route Armies, though constituting only a small proportion of the armies of China, have inflicted two-fifths of the total casualties suffered by the Japanese in 1941 and 1942.

Under the circumstances it is clear that regardless of the rights and wrongs in China's internal political struggle it would be a catastrophe if civil war were to break out. Nor can a continuation of the present armed truce, which has resulted in the withdrawal from combat of half a million central government troops to watch the Eighth Route Army, be regarded as a satisfactory state of affairs. Some way of settling the conflict must be worked out before China can play an offensive role in the war against Japan. But the gulf that separates the contestants is too broad to be easily bridged. The position of the gov-

ernment is simple, and logical. Since there cannot be two governments and two armies in China, the Communists, as the minority, should abandon their separate regime. The Communists have taken the stand that they can afford to do this only if democratic machinery is set up in China which will permit a minority party to function effectively. They also feel that some agrarian reform is essential for getting the mass support demanded by a total war. There is logic in their position.

The solution of the problem is a matter for China alone to discover. Advice on details from this side of the Pacific is likely to be of little value. But it is necessarily of concern to us in the United States, as partners in a common war, that China should work out an early and equitable settlement of its internal conflict, so as to hasten the final defeat of the enemy and the liberation of the Chinese nation.

Some Notes on Harlem

BY MARGARET MARSHALL

BECAUSE the recent trouble in Harlem was not, narrowly speaking, a "race riot," there is a tendency to heave a sigh of relief, compliment the New York City administration for handling it so efficiently, and forget the whole thing. But citizens of the largest city in the country—which ought to set the pace for the intelligent handling of race relations—should consider the Harlem riot not as a closed incident but as a sharp warning. This may sound like alarmist talk. It is, on the contrary, a sober judgment based on the reports of reliable and realistic observers. I am merely summing up their views.

What happened on the night of August 1? A white policeman, James Collins, stationed in the lobby of a hotel which has long been notorious, attempted to arrest a woman, Margie Polite, for using profane language. A Negro military policeman, Robert Bandy, intervened, grabbed the officer's nightstick, and beat Collins over the head with it. I take this account from the *Amsterdam News*, a leading Negro newspaper. "Bandy then ran out of the hotel and Patrolman Collins shot him in the left shoulder. Collins then placed the soldier under arrest and took him to Sydenham Hospital, with a crowd following. Someone in the crowd shouted, 'A white policeman killed a Negro soldier.' That set off the spark." There followed hours of mob violence in which six people were killed and hundreds injured, while stores were smashed and looted, with damage estimated at more than \$5,000,000. Food and liquor stores were special targets.

It was not a race riot, we are told, but there is no question that the violence was primarily directed against whites. The stores attacked were mainly those owned by

white people. One young colored woman who mixed with the crowd told me that the people felt they were getting revenge on the storekeepers who sell inferior goods at high prices. Many, no doubt, could not resist the simple desire to get things they wanted and needed—another observer told of a Negro woman who directed her child to get a “spring-mattress” for her because she had always wanted a “spring-mattress”! Then too, looting is infectious, but it would not have assumed such proportions if it had not been fed by long-smoldering resentment against poverty and discrimination. White property was fair game because the people of Harlem firmly believe that white owners have nothing but contempt for the community, never contribute to its welfare financially or otherwise, and are interested only in exploiting colored people.

Much praise has been bestowed upon the city administration for the intelligence and dispatch with which it handled the affair—and much is due—but many Negroes also feel that the riots were in part the cumulative result of a policy of law enforcement in Harlem which has been far too lenient in its handling of day-by-day infractions of ordinary civic decency. It is common knowledge that on the streets of Harlem filthy language, the peddling of dope, the depredations of “baby thugs,” sidewalk crap games, the molestation of women who live there, and all the other manifestations of hoodlumism go on continuously—and are largely ignored by policemen who have been told to “go slow” in order to avoid any charge of discrimination or who share the minority psychology that it doesn’t matter as long as Negroes are only invading the rights of other Negroes. “Mayor La Guardia,” writes one commentator in the *Amsterdam News*, “referred to the hotel where the trouble started as a ‘dive.’ Well, if it is a dive why has it been allowed to remain open, with police officers stationed there on a twenty-four-hour watch?” (My italics.) That is a very pertinent question.

So much for the immediate events. What about the fundamental cause? It can be summed up in one word—segregation. All the immediate as well as the intermediate and remote causes of the trouble in Harlem, from high rents to hoodlumism, can be traced back to the Jim Crow mentality, which was bred in the South and has infected the whole country. It is true that the Negro has on the whole received better treatment in New York City than in any other part of the nation. And in a way this very circumstance tends to obscure the ugly fact that Harlem is essentially a black ghetto, created and perpetuated not only by successive migrations of Negroes from the South, where segregation is taken for granted, but by the ignorance, fear, prejudice, indifference—and benevolence—of New York’s white majority. Inevitably Harlem has all the characteristics of a ghetto—cultural isolation, economic discrimination, bad housing, over-

crowding, exploitation by members of the majority race, a high rate of juvenile delinquency—in short all the evils of the white world in exaggerated form.

I suspect that even enlightened New Yorkers, some of whose best friends are Negroes, seldom face the reality of Harlem. And I suggest that they take a look at that section of their city not as a place where they have fun on Saturday night but as an isolated community where a minority lives and has its being—and stews in its own juice.

At the end of the last war Harlem had a population of some 125,000. Harlem was, indeed, created by World War I. There was a great migration, carried north by the tide of industrial expansion which that war induced. It was, so to speak, a “healthy” migration. There were jobs at the end of the trek. And the people who came to Harlem during those years were assimilated, at least into their city within a city.

In 1943 Harlem has a population of some 400,000; and a great many of the people who have contributed to this increase, particularly in the last ten years, headed north in other, rather ill-starred migrations, propelled by depression. They came looking for jobs, to be sure, but also for relief from hunger and eviction and all the other ills that Negroes in the South are heir to. It stands to reason that many of them were maladjusted, subjectively as well as objectively, in their native communities. In Harlem they found, perhaps not jobs, perhaps only a bed in some relative’s already over-crowded flat, but a kind of freedom with poverty in a huge city—which is a perfect set-up for hoodlumism.

In the best of circumstances, it would have been difficult for a community to assimilate this constant stream of newcomers, who hailed, moreover, from backward regions. Add to this the fact that hoodlumism is an old story in any ghetto, and the further fact that police control of a majority over a minority tends toward brutality on the one hand and, on the other, toward a laxity induced by the minority psychology, which I have already mentioned. A Negro may be viciously beaten for molesting a white visitor in Harlem; but decent citizens of Harlem complain that they do not feel safe on the streets of their own community after dark.

The war, of course, has introduced other important and exacerbating factors, both psychological and economic. In normal times segregation breeds a defensive attitude among Negroes that ranges from the militant advocacy of equality to black chauvinism and plain irresponsibility. The war has accentuated these tendencies. It has dramatized for Negroes their position as a minority, creating fresh resentment against all the disabilities of segregation. And these disabilities are glaringly pointed up by the constant discrimination and frequent violence meted out to Negroes in the armed forces of a country that is fighting in the name of democracy. On

the economic side, resentment has been increased, not diminished, by such prosperity and status as the war has conferred on colored workers, for where equality does not exist, the demand for it is as easily incited by prosperity as by poverty.

Segregation is, at best, a compromise that white Americans make with their democratic principles and their belief in human dignity. In the long run it not only corrupts both races; it simply does not work, for it perpetuates and intensifies oppression of the minority and it must invariably react against those who impose it.

Harlem is a tragic example of this fact. Another example, even more serious because it is sanctioned by law, is to be found in the practical effects, already observable, of the Supreme Court decision which ordered equal, but not necessarily identical, facilities for Negroes. Negroes now are occasionally admitted to Pullman dining cars—and subjected to the humiliation of being screened from the view of white passengers. And in the far more crucial field of education, that decision has brought about the establishment for Negroes of third-rate graduate professional schools, which insure the isolation of a minority whose one hope of acceptance and integration depends upon free access to the main streams of culture.

It is obvious that the white majority is not yet ready to abandon the disastrous policy of segregation. But whites as well as blacks who have a genuine belief in democracy should understand with their hearts as well as their minds that segregation must be eliminated, and they must advocate immediate policies that contribute toward that end.

In Harlem, for instance, these immediate policies should include, above all, equality in employment and wages, decent housing, an intensive program of social education and rehabilitation and respect for the rights of the individual. It should include also a policy of law enforcement which will be as strict against the ordinary infractions of public behavior in Harlem as it is in other parts of the city. We may be sure that the great majority of citizens in Harlem would support such a policy, for leniency in this regard is only discrimination in reverse.

As for Negroes, they too have a responsibility, and their most intelligent spokesmen have been the first to say so. While insisting steadily on equality, Negro leaders must impress upon their followers the fact that law and order, impartially and decently administered and scrupulously observed, are the principal safeguard of any minority.

Pay for Your Own Inflation

BY JEROME WEINSTEIN

LIKE an advancing forest fire, inflationary price increases spurt through the dry tinder of excess purchasing power. And just as a forest fire grown out of hand is brought under control by a back fire, deliberately set to burn out an area ahead of the advancing blaze, so can inflation, artificially created and properly controlled, be used to check the ravages of an uncontrolled inflation.

Price increases initiated and regulated by the government can be substituted for inflation. This artificial inflation may be used to bring supply and demand into balance in a way that will accomplish the following desirable social objectives: (1) allocation of the burden of inflated prices to those who indulge in excess spending; (2) transformation into government revenues of the price increases, which otherwise would constitute unearned profits for those who deal in consumers' goods; and (3) assurance to every individual of his essential share of vital necessities at uninflated prices.

By such artificial inflation the forces of supply and demand can be made to play their functional part in the machinery of distribution—machinery which is now near collapse despite price ceilings, rationing, and subsidies.

Prices are rising because the amount of money people are willing and able to spend for goods exceeds the aggregate value of these goods at current prices. Such increases due to excess demand result in increased profits and normally stimulate additional production, which restores a balance between supply and demand at some lower price level. But in the present circumstances, when the resources which can be devoted to the production of consumers' goods are necessarily limited, this stimulus of additional profits cannot call forth the usual response of increased supply. This is what makes inflation.

Can we stabilize prices on a level at which demand exceeds supply? Not so long as the inexorable law of supply and demand continues to operate. And it will continue to operate while the facilities of distribution are privately owned and operated. For within the framework of a price-and-profit economy, we cannot legislate against the forces which make it function. Price-control measures will be effective within that framework only to the extent that they increase supply or reduce demand. Price ceilings do the reverse, tending to increase demand. To the extent that they are effective they enable people to purchase more goods. In the same way, price roll-

backs, which operate only as subsidies to consumers, tend to increase the unbalance between demand and supply by increasing the purchasing power of money.

Rationing, to the extent that it is effective, does reduce demand. However, rationing is effective only at the subsistence level at which all consumers are equal. But we have to deal with a substantial surplus of goods over and above the bare minimum for existence. On what basis is that surplus to be distributed? If it is left to supply and demand, the higher prices paid for the surplus will inevitably create a black market in the goods which should be sold at subsistence price levels, and if we attempt to distribute this surplus through an equal rationing, we face the obvious fact that the privilege of buying and the financial means required for the exercise of that privilege are materially different things.

Price increases reduce effective demand by driving out of the market those marginal buyers who are unable or unwilling to pay the higher price; those who can and will pay more find the purchasing power of their money reduced. This happens regardless of the cause of price increases. A sales tax which adds 20 per cent to the cost of goods will drive out marginal buyers and reduce the purchasing power in the same way as a 20-per-cent rise caused by inflationary demand. To the extent that any price increase, however caused, uses up purchasing power, it eliminates that purchasing power as a continuing force of effective demand.

A general sales tax could be used to increase artificially the prices of consumer goods to the level that would otherwise be reached if inflationary demand were left unchecked. But those price increases would accrue to the government by way of tax revenues instead of constituting unearned profits. The hardship to a consumer who pays a dollar a pound for steak, including sales tax, is no greater than the hardship of paying the same price because of excess demand.

The objection to such use of a general sales tax is that, like uncontrolled inflation, it falls upon the just and unjust alike. It burdens consumption at the subsistence level as heavily as consumption at a luxury level. It fails to distinguish between the pound of meat that is an absolute necessity and the pound of meat that is bought with extravagant spending. It stabilizes prices at the expense of the poor for the benefit of the rich. A tax that cuts the poor man's consumption by a third will not check the appetites of the wealthy. And what goods the poor man cannot buy because of the tax will become available for the rich to consume.

The use of a general sales tax to inflate prices artificially will, except for the tax revenues to be derived, bring with it all the evils of inflation itself. It will not limit the burden of increased prices to those whose excessive spending has caused the price increase. Nor will it assure to every individual the opportunity to buy his

essential share of the necessities of life at uninflated price levels. Any acceptable method of artificial inflation must, if possible, do these things.

Can a solution for the problem be found by exempting food or clothing from the sales tax? This would only divert spending from the taxed fields of expenditure into the untaxed fields of expenditure. It would further increase the demand, and consequently the prices, for these goods, and thus defeat its own purpose.

The end in view, however, could be achieved by a direct and currently payable tax upon the use of purchasing power in excess of an exempt minimum amount. The tax would progressively increase in rate to the point necessary to achieve a balance between spending and available goods. It would apply to those consumers' goods which by price increases reflect the pressure of excessive inflationary demand—primarily food, clothing, and household goods. Exemption would be given to an amount deemed adequate to cover the cost of goods required for subsistence.

Under this plan there would be issued to every individual coupons covering the exempt amount. Such coupons in money denominations would be used in the purchase of goods in the same way that ration coupons are now used. In the event that the consumer wanted more coupons, he would be required to purchase them, at progressively higher rates. For instance, the first \$200 of extra coupons could be taxed at the rate of \$20 a hundred; the next \$200 at \$35 a hundred; and the next \$200 at \$50 a hundred. The more an individual spent for foods and other taxed goods, the more he would be required to pay in taxes and the less would be the purchasing power of his money. The tax would represent an increase in the price of necessities at the point where they start to be consumed as luxuries. In this way the tax would equalize the competition between higher and lower income groups for the same goods. Retailer collection of coupons could be made certain by requiring their submission along with stock-replacement orders. The retailer who failed to collect coupons could not replenish his stocks and would soon be out of business.

To assure the priority of demands based on essential consumption, wholesalers would be required to give a preference to such retailers' orders as were supported by exempt coupons, which would have a distinctive color. This would assure to every individual his essential share of the necessities of life at uninflated prices. Both free and taxed coupons would be issued for periods of two or three months in order to prevent hoarding. If coupons were issued on an annual basis, there would be a rush of anticipatory buying to guard against the contingency of inflationary price increases a year hence.

The use of a periodic basis would also give that flexibility which is essential to any control of excess buying. As our reserve stock of consumers' goods disappears,

the inflationary gap continues to widen. By lowering or raising a ceiling on the maximum amount of extra coupons which could be purchased within any one period, it would be possible to restrict spending above the subsistence level to the amount of goods then available.

The progressive taxation of excess spending would in itself serve as a flexible, self-rationing measure. Each consumer would ration and adjust his periodic, tax-exempt purchasing power to satisfy his own particular demands. He would not sacrifice his ability to buy food without payment of a tax in order to buy a pair of shoes for which he had no immediate need. This restriction on spending would make it possible to dispense with much of the specific rationing now in effect.

The rationing of those few commodities of which there existed an absolute shortage could be continued. Special ration coupons could be included in each book of free coupons. In this way it would be possible to administer the rationing of all such commodities by a single comprehensive scheme.

A black market in free coupons is not likely, for such coupons would merely suffice to cover a subsistence level of expenditure. A black market in extra coupons could be effectively checked. Every individual might be required to present his pass book in order to purchase extra coupons, and the amount of each purchase would be entered therein. He could also be required to file his pass book with his income-tax return. Discrepancies between expenditure and income would be obvious and create a situation every taxpayer would seek to avoid.

The method here proposed balances supply with demand by depreciation of the purchasing power of money used for excess spending. The tax becomes a progressive discount rate which the state applies currently to dollars used for purchases beyond a subsistence level. The thousandth dollar spent buys less than the six-hundredth dollar spent and still less than the first dollar spent.

The same depreciation of purchasing power would occur with inflation. As more and more money would be spent, it would become worth less and less in terms of goods. Thus the proposed tax is equivalent to inflation in its effect upon prices and upon the aggregate demand of all consumers. It differs from inflation in that, by the use of exemptions and progressive rates, the burden of higher prices is distributed in accordance with ability to pay. At the same time, it gives the state a source of substantial revenue.

This is inflation *à la carte*. Each consumer will create his own private measure of inflation. The price increases which he must pay are to be determined by his own spending. He cannot impose upon others the burden of price increases caused by his excessive demands on a limited supply of goods. The cost of inflation is placed, as it should be, upon those who cause it. This is the inflation that can beat inflation.

10 Years Ago in "The Nation"

THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION is swinging toward the left. By this I mean primarily that the progressive elements represented by Secretaries Ickes, Perkins, and Wallace are steadily gaining influence at the White House at the expense of the reactionary and partisan elements personified by Budget Director Douglas and Postmaster "Genial Jim" Farley.—PAUL Y. ANDERSON, *August 2, 1933.*

TRAMPS are an old phenomenon in the United States—indeed practically an institution—but hitherto they have been of masculine gender. No longer, it seems. The Women's Bureau in Washington, in summarizing a survey made in nearly 800 cities . . . found 9,769 women moving from one place to another, unattached, jobless, and homeless.—*August 9, 1933.*

STRANGE AS IT MAY SEEM to one arriving in Moscow from the Western world, the Bolsheviks are still obsessed by the fear of imminent war on the Soviet Union. . . . Any number of important Bolsheviks sincerely believe the bourgeois states are preparing to invade the U. S. S. R. in the near future.—LOUIS FISCHER, *August 9, 1933.*

DON'T COMMIT SUICIDE. Find out what's wrong with you. A staff of eminent psychologists is at your disposal in the *Modern Psychologist*.—(ADVT.) *August 16, 1933.*

WE ARE GLAD to note that official Washington is waking up to the need of an unremitting campaign for unemployment relief and is trying to prevent newspaper ballyhoo about improving conditions from jeopardizing the work of raising funds for the distressed.—*August 23, 1933.*

THE HEARINGS [by the New York State Public Service Commission] brought to light the fact that officials of the companies under investigation had . . . increased their pay by \$130,000 in 1932 alone, and that during the depression official salaries had increased by 17 to 77 per cent. . . . Some 8,000 . . . employees have been laid off. . . . Many employees have received wage cuts as high as 50 per cent.—JEROME COUNT, *August 23, 1933.* . . . Power and light employees wanted as union organizers for nation-wide campaign. . . . Write qualifications. Brotherhood of Edison Employees.—(ADVT.) *August 30, 1933.*

THE HERCULEAN EFFORTS of Hugh S. Johnson and his associates during the last week have resulted in a large collection of completed codes, chief among them those covering the steel, oil, and lumber industries.—*August 30, 1933.*

THE TENDER-HEARTED NAZIS, pausing in the midst of their pogroms and the belaboring of interned political dissenters . . . have decreed an end to vivisection in the Reich.—*August 30, 1933.*

"The Beginning of the End"

BY DONALD W. MITCHELL

SELDOM has President Roosevelt made a more prophetic statement than his reference to the successful invasion of Sicily as marking "the beginning of the end." Less than a year after El Alamein and Stalingrad, the high-water marks of German power, the close of the war is clearly in sight. Today the enemies of the Axis stand in the best military position since 1939.

If the President's statement is to be criticized from any angle, it is incorrect in that it appears to attribute to action on one front—the southern European—credit that belongs to many and diverse factors. For the military position in which we now find ourselves rests not on any one success, but rather on a combination of triumphs on every front.

Almost overlooked in the midst of more dramatic events has been the victory in the Atlantic, which has permitted a concentration of greater man-power and munitions of war in Western Europe. The battle of ship production has now clearly been won. When a wolf-pack of twenty-five German submarines loses three of its members without being able to approach a convoy close enough to fire a torpedo, it is a sign that the battle of the Atlantic is turning against the Axis. And our turnout of anti-submarine weapons has not yet reached its peak.

The German bid for victory in Russia has fared no better. Slight gains might reasonably have been anticipated from the attempt to reduce the Kursk salient—made in considerable force and under favorable conditions. The utter failure of this offensive is a portent for the future. The heavy losses of man-power, the dispersion and weakening of German air strength, combined with the enormous improvements in Russian organization and tactics, have produced a new situation. The Red Army is qualitatively superior to the *Wehrmacht*, and it almost certainly has greater reserves. Even the digging-in process which has accompanied the change from Blitzkrieg warfare to that of attrition has not prevented the Red Army, in its turn, from launching successful offensives in areas strategically vital to Germany. Though these have been undertaken in superior force, they have not resulted in any serious weakening of Russian defenses elsewhere, as the Germans have learned to their cost after trying diversionary attacks. The long and unbroken retreat out of Russia which marked the doom of Napoleon is now well under way in the case of Hitler. And, as in the Battle of the Atlantic, time is now on the side of the Allies. The Russians are becoming stronger as Germany's strength ebbs. Already there is a suggestion of demoralization in the German retreat.

In the air, too, the United Nations are winning the war. Losses in June were so heavy that some critics feared the margin of profit in aerial bombing had been wiped out. However, during a lull of several weeks, a shift was made in command, squadrons were regrouped, and a new technique was worked out. The late July and early August raids were then undertaken in record-breaking force. More distant penetrations of Germany were made without a proportionate increase of losses. Even in repeated saturation raids on the same target, such as those over Hamburg, not attempted earlier for fear of too heavy loss, the number of British planes downed ranged only from 4 to 5 per cent. The far more accurate precision work of the Americans, directed at such targets as oil refineries and synthetic rubber plants, has further cut down Germany's industrial output. There is widespread difference of opinion as to whether bombing alone can win the war, but there is no possible denial that our present campaign is steadily reducing Germany's industrial and military potential. And it will be conducted in far greater force in the months directly ahead. These are the three major fronts in the European struggle. In none of them is there the remotest likelihood that the Axis will be able to reverse the trend.

It is nevertheless in Sicily and Italy that the growing weakness of the Axis has been most clearly shown. The invasion of Sicily was expected to result in Allied success. With sea and air superiority, better supply lines, a higher grade of troops, and proved leadership on our side, nothing else was possible. What was startling was the rapidity of the early gains, the physical and moral collapse of Italian resistance, and the swift political repercussions in Italy. Equally marked was the improvement in the American armed forces. Our armies have come a long way since their fights in Tunisia. Hitler's refusal even to attempt defending the entire Italian peninsula, while perfectly sound strategically, was the first clear admission of defeat made by official quarters in Germany. Long overmatched at sea and in the air, the Germans, by deciding to contract their lines of defense on land, made a most significant confession of inferiority.

The conquest of Sicily opens up new offensive possibilities for an Italian campaign, with a penetration into the Balkans or southern France following success on the peninsula. This drive might be undertaken in considerable strength, for the divisions used by Eisenhower were clearly only the spearhead of much larger armies available, of forces in the Mediterranean theater which the Germans estimated at fifty-nine to sixty-four divi-

sions. These forecasts are based on the assumption that Italy will not escape the German yoke. Should it decide to capitulate, the outlook would be even more favorable for the Allies.

Of even greater importance than our military gains, striking as they have been, are the psychological effects on Hitler-occupied Europe. The satellite powers have grown increasingly restless and uncooperative, and conquered peoples everywhere are encouraged to continue and intensify their resistance. German man-power, already strained by the Russian war, is certain to prove ever more inadequate to keep subject peoples in control, protect against invasion at many points, and at least supervise and direct slave labor. For nearly two years people in western Germany have been promised protection and revenge on England "once Russia is disposed of." American aid was to be kept at arm's length by the U-boats. Goebbels in both cases has been forced to admit failure. Even a people as docile and well regimented as the Germans must sometimes recall unfulfilled promises. For an entire year all military news has been bad news. As the casualty lists lengthen, with only Nazi defeats to show for them, the time is rapidly passing when an intelligent German can expect anything but eventual defeat. No propaganda on earth can succeed under such circumstances. In terms of World War I, we have reached the July, 1918, stage, when the last great German drive

fell short of victory and only an exhausted, bleeding homeland, sure of failure, starved by four years of Allied blockade, and ready for moral collapse, remained back of the German lines.

It is time for our war leaders to recognize the fact that conditions in Europe have changed drastically from the days when overwhelming Axis power made cautious, limited offensives advisable. A Germany convinced of defeat, inferior in the air, weakened by blockade, bled white by four years of war, with many industries, transport lines, and ports in ruins, is a far different antagonist from the Germany of 1939, 1940, or even 1941. As the Sicilian campaign showed, the number of enemy divisions under such circumstances is completely meaningless. If we wish to shorten the war, now is the time to strike. Propaganda, air power, sea power, military forces must all be utilized to the utmost and in locations vital to the Axis. Denmark, the Low Countries, northern France all offer more crucial battlefields than Italy, southern France, or the Balkans. It is, of course, hardly possible, unless such plans have already been made, to improvise a successful attack in these areas. What is to be hoped is that our war planners, remembering the maxim of Napoleon that "the moral is to the material as three is to one," have anticipated the present situation and are preparing to open a third front which will afford possibilities for bringing the war to an early end.

Italy and the Pessimists

BY LOUIS GRABER

MUSSOLINI'S fall has raised problems which go to the root of the peace and the future of European democracy. To recognize these problems and to solve them correctly is obviously the most urgent task of democrats everywhere. For on their farsightedness and political sagacity rests the decision as to who will pluck the fruits of our military victories—the forces of progress or a more or less disguised reaction. But the revolution in Italy, the first great crack in the structure of fascist Europe, has plainly caught world democracy off guard.

The liberals of America are pessimistic—too pessimistic. They have seen the forces of reaction conquering one stronghold after another, in part because of the cowardice of "realists" and their willingness to compromise. It is understandable that many liberals have in consequence become doubly suspicious of all maneuvers and compromises. But their fearfulness has been carried too far. To suspect, a priori, every victory gained by democracy, to make pessimism a political philosophy, is

to undermine the forces of progress and sow confusion. This shortsightedness in the camp of the sincere liberals and the convinced anti-fascists may well have more dangerous results than all the intrigues and master plans that the various pseudo-Metternichs carry around in their vest pockets.

The weakness of the left has emerged glaringly in its failure to estimate correctly the present Italian situation. Many of our progressive columnists declared themselves disappointed. One called the fall of Mussolini "the first cousin of the recent Argentine coup d'état." Another found fault with the fact that Mussolini had not been overthrown by a popular movement, but merely by a palace revolution. A third complained that it was not the forces of anti-fascism, but rather the military defeats, that had forced Il Duce to abdicate. But on one point they all agree: that the King and Badoglio, far from being democrats, are accomplices of fascism.

About this last point no argument is possible. In analyzing a political situation, however, it isn't enough

to observe merely the gestures and actions of the men who pass themselves off as the leading actors but who are in reality lowly extras. Was what happened in Italy only a palace revolution, provoked by our military victories? Of course; but it was the anti-fascist convictions of the Italian masses, their resistance to the Mussolini régime, which caused the military machine to crumble and made it ripe for defeat. No revolution has ever occurred out of a blue sky. Before the people can act it is necessary for the ruling régime first to document its own bankruptcy.

Naturally the ruling clique will try to divert the revolution from its path and save itself by means of compromises and intrigues, and to recognize and expose these deceptions is important. But it is equally important to preserve one's perspective and to place the Italian coup d'état in its true relation to the pattern of current events.

The two weeks that have elapsed since Mussolini's fall, we are assured from quarters that should know better, have substantiated the worst fears of the pessimists: "Nothing has changed in Italy!" This way of thinking shows a complete disregard of the real motivating powers of the Italian revolution. What, then, has changed? Only that Italian fascism has publicly announced its bankruptcy, shown itself incapable even of arousing itself to the empty gesture of a heroic exit. Only that in spite of a dictatorship of twenty years' duration, in spite of propaganda and secret police, in spite of jail and castor oil and concentration camps, the Italian masses dashed to the streets in the very first hour, shouting "Long live democracy!" Only that a mere four hours after Mussolini's resignation, manifestos, pamphlets, and newspapers appeared, testifying to the force of Italian democracy and the unity of the anti-fascist front.

I am not even mentioning here the *military* results of the overthrow and its possible effects on the future course of the war. Like *The Nation*, I believe that "the *political* results may be more valuable," though not just "for the Allied cause," but for the entire development of the anti-fascist battle in Europe. It is precisely this side of the question that is being completely overlooked by many spokesmen of democracy. And this seems to me a dangerous symptom, a symptom of the sectarianism and false radicalism that have come to take root in the ranks of the left, a symptom of its lack of self-confidence.

How else did people imagine the revolution in Italy would occur? And what preconceptions have they now concerning the coming revolution in Germany? Did they expect a democratic government to follow close on the heels of Hitler, the "black night of barbarism" to be succeeded instantaneously by the "resplendent dawn of liberty"? The revolutions that will follow the collapse of fascism and nazism in Europe will not run a straight course. And we must shape our strategy and tactics accordingly.

I hope that no one will conclude from these remarks that I have the faintest esteem for the Badoglio régime or even advocate our coming to terms with it. My contention is simply that this interregnum should prove an unwitting blessing to Italian democracy and the struggle against fascism.

From the first, Badoglio has had only two possibilities from which to choose: to capitulate or to continue the war on the side of Germany. Should he surrender unconditionally, his régime will be completely identified with the defeat. Italian democracy really has no reason to compete with the marshal for undertaking this nasty job of liquidation. How much better it would have been for the course of democracy in Germany if in 1918 Hindenburg and Ludendorff, rather than Ebert and Scheidemann, had formalized the capitulation!

Should Badoglio make the second choice, which he clearly appears to have done, who can doubt that his effort to carry on the fight must very soon end with his downfall and that he will drag the monarchy down with him? This course will in fact provide the best method for converting to the cause of democracy and a free republic even those conservative elements in the Italian population which for sentimental reasons still cling to the monarchy.

The parties that are united in the Italian anti-fascist front have seen the situation clearly. They did not rush to demand the fall of the King and Badoglio. In their very first manifesto they demanded a break with Germany, peace, guarantees of the basic democratic rights, and the liberation of all political prisoners. The Communists did not talk of soviets; the Republicans made no mention of a republic; and the Socialists said nothing about socialism. Instead, they found a common platform and demonstrated their ability to think and act with clear political judgment.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of some of our democratic theorists, whose attitude has been determined primarily by resentment and moral indignation over the personal histories of Victor Emmanuel and Marshal Badoglio. It may be readily admitted that the sentiment of these liberals is praiseworthy and their indignation understandable, but the fact that our progressive columnists and the Italian exiles have no illusions about Badoglio and the King happens to be immaterial. The great majority of the Italian people immediately after Mussolini's fall thought that the King and his Marshal had freed them of fascism and would bring them peace. It is essential that they be cured of these illusions. They are in fact being cured, but after twenty years of dictatorship time is obviously needed for political truths to penetrate.

This loss of time—which in any case will be very limited—is more than offset by the fact that when the Badoglio government falls, no Italian will be able to say that the Allies wantonly overthrew "an upright man

and a great soldier" merely because he did not suit their purposes. On the contrary, the downfall of the régime will clearly reflect its failure to fulfill the will of the Italian people.

It is true that Badoglio's hesitation has given the Germans time to consolidate their power in northern Italy, and it is good propaganda to hammer home that fact to the Italian people. But in reality no Italian government would have been able to prevent this development. The preparation and execution of adequate military operations to checkmate the Nazis would have required time no matter who was in control.

But, it is protested, is there not a grave danger that a Badoglio who *accepts* the conditions of the Allies and is in turn supported by them will stabilize his régime and the pro-fascist monarchy, thus barring the way to the construction of a true democracy? This fear, too, shows a lack of understanding. Even if it adopted a pseudo-democratic course, Badoglio's administration could only be temporary. The enormous problems posed by twenty years of fascism and by defeat will grow increasingly complicated. Only a genuinely democratic government supported by the entire population can solve these problems. Where fascism, which could embellish its dictator-

ship with a pseudo-social and pseudo-revolutionary ideology, failed, a naked military dictatorship is even less equipped to block the democratic process of rejuvenation. And a *beaten* military dictatorship has no chance at all.

I don't believe in the theory that the liberated nations will be confronted with a "political vacuum." The fall of the dictators will doubtless bring to the helm transient régimes *à la* Badoglio—generals in Germany, more or less reactionary politicians in Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. These régimes will attempt to save themselves by making concessions to democracy. The victorious powers will, out of pure self-interest and military necessity, occupy these countries, enforce disarmament, and liquidate the police machines. With the annihilation of the fascist and Nazi political structures and provision for the basic requirements of an expression of the popular will, the military governments and armies of occupation will have completely fulfilled their historic task. If public opinion in the democracies sees to it that they stop then and there, everything else can be safely left to the people of the liberated countries.

[*A conflicting view of the Allied handling of Italy is presented by J. Alvarez del Vayo elsewhere in this issue.*]

England Teaches Its Soldiers

BY REINHOLD NIEBUHR

YOU will find the troops very critical," the educational officer told me, somewhat apologetically, as he ushered me into a cavernous assembly hall deep in the side of the cliffs. I was on a speaking tour of British army camps, and the assignment on the first day was a coast-guard battalion on the south coast. The topic was the reconstruction of Europe after the war. The British army has gone in not only for education, but for progressive education. I was asked by the officer to make the opening address brief so that there would be sufficient time for discussion. The discussion was lively and to the point. I did find the troops critical, sometimes to the point of deep skepticism about the possibility of any significant post-war reconstruction.

The first question in this discussion period came from a sergeant. "Do you think," he asked, "that white nations that allow conditions which produce Detroit race riots are capable of reconstructing the world in such a way that the colored nations will have their just place in the scheme of things?" The question led to some critical estimates of the virtues and capacities for world statesmanship to be found in the United Nations. I sought in the discussion to discover whether the remarks were

primarily expressions of British resentment against color prejudice in the American army or an indication of a wholesome sense of the common guilt of all the white nations. I discovered that both moods were present in fairly equal proportions.

The British soldiers are not at all afraid to ask, and are capable of asking, questions which deal critically with the ideas and attitudes, the policies and program of their own nation. I was sometimes informed that the critical attitude of the British army was caused by the years of frustration spent in home camps, waiting and training for the invasion of Europe. It seems to me more likely that it is the consequence of the very wide and extensive program of social and political education conducted by British army authorities. The soldiers' questions invariably indicated a general background of informed opinion. In a week of forums, not a silly question was asked. The only irrelevant questions were those dealing with the wide differential in wages between British and American soldiers, an unfortunate source of friction between the two armies, which Canada has wisely eliminated by withholding a part of the troops' wages through forced savings.

The British army is prepared to let education leaven the lump of army discipline. Again and again educational officers told me that they began their work under a cloud of suspicion on the part of general officers, who were afraid that free discussion of the causes and probable consequences of the war might distract soldiers from that single-minded devotion to the immediate task which army discipline requires. But they usually reported that the field officers were ultimately converted by the improved morale of the troops. I did hear of some cases in which field officers were able to emasculate the educational program, making it both innocuous and uninteresting. Yet the fact is that, on the whole, the British army is not afraid of education for democracy, while our own army shows every indication of harboring such fears.

A part of the British educational scheme dates from 1920, when the Army Education Corps was organized on the basis of a special report issued by a committee under the chairmanship of Lord Gorell. The present educational program is carried on inside the army under the supervision of a Directorate of Education in the War Office, and the Education Corps has its special officers in every district, area, and divisional headquarters. The actual classes and forums are usually conducted by warrant officers in regimental and battalion units. A special premium is placed upon discussion, and the officers are asked to report the length of each discussion and the number of participants.

In 1939 a Central Advisory Council for Adult Education in His Majesty's Forces was organized, consisting of representatives of the universities, the Board of Education, and local educational authorities. The council, which is subdivided into twenty-three regional units, renders the best educational talent of the nation available for the task of army education. I know of no similar body in our own country; and I have the uneasy feeling that the failure of American educators to interest themselves in the problem of army education is responsible to a large degree for the comparative educational backwardness of the American army. The Educational

and the Advisory Council route a large number of lecturers through the army camps. The educational officers are also encouraged to make use of whatever talent is to be found within their respective units. Frequently, regular army officers are drawn into the educational program, and ex-journalists and teachers within the ranks are used according to their several abilities.

In addition, the Y. M. C. A. carries on a general, as well as religious, educational program. Frequently, in sections where there are many camps, the Y. M. C. A. provides a special educational center, different in atmosphere from the regular camp, and organizes special classes for soldiers. Part of the Y. M. C. A. educational program is conducted by women, who have for various

reasons, some of them obvious, proved particularly acceptable to the troops.

The "textbooks" for the social and political education of soldiers are of two varieties. A series of pamphlets with the general heading, "British Way and Purpose," discusses all aspects of British democratic history, of present political, economic, and social problems, and of future prospects. A special Army Bureau of Current Affairs publishes a weekly bulletin in which current problems are analyzed and questions suitable for discussion suggested. The special problems of practically every nation and region of the world have been taken up by the A. B. C. A. While it was reported that some officers tried to discourage discussion of the Beveridge Report, I can testify that I visited no educational center which did not display a large graph illustrating the meaning of the Beveridge social-security plan. Many British soldiers asked me whether we had a similar plan and were surprised when I told them of the report of the National Resources Planning Board.

Aside from the general educational program, every kind of individual interest is encouraged and facilities are provided for constructive hobbies. I discovered a class in Esperanto in one unit, and in another an educational officer reported that special phonograph records had been provided for a group especially interested in chamber music.

Compared with this British program, the United States Army is culturally and educationally poverty-stricken, though it is not poor in any other respect. In Britain, the American Red Cross carries on the activities which are performed in the United States by the USO and there are Red Cross clubs in every part of the British Isles for our soldiers. There is no lack of entertainment. Moving pictures and theatrical performances are plentiful. American soldiers can get unlimited amounts of cigarettes tax free, while British soldiers are limited to five tax-free cigarettes a day. Naturally, chocolate bars are also more plentiful among our service men.

The United States Army in Britain publishes both a daily paper and a weekly magazine, both of which are very sprightly. The paper not only carries baseball box scores but has a daily photo of some glamor queen, usually a Hollywood star. The regular publication of these pictures is presumably for the purpose of providing "pin-ups" to enliven the bare walls of the barracks. In short, nothing is lacking in the United States Army except serious discussion about the meaning of the war and the best means of using the fruits of victory creatively.

Some American officers and soldiers who came to my public meetings in London told me that there was absolutely no opportunity in the army for serious talk about social and political issues. I discovered that this is not exactly true; but it is broadly true. There are, of course,

the orientation courses given during the soldiers' training period, some of which are very good but most of which are mediocre. Moreover, the personnel of the Special Services division of the army, which is in charge of the activities that beguile a soldier's leisure, does boast two special officers in charge of education, as well as a number of officers who, impressed by the British program, are emulating the discussion groups of the British army, as are also some of the Red Cross clubs.

Nevertheless, these casual and individual efforts are piddling compared with the highly organized British system. An education program cannot be effective in the army if it is not launched under auspices that have indisputable prestige, if it is not carried through systematically to the various units, and if it lacks proper literature. There is no indication that our army contemplates such a program.

Perhaps it ought to be added that the British chaplains have been drawn into the educational program through the institution of a "padre's hour" in which the chaplain presides over an informal discussion in which no serious subject is barred. Our chaplains, on the other hand, are limited to formal religious services. Except for a few specially talented chaplains, this means that their contact with the troops is minimal. The British army is now initiating institutes in sex education and seeking to make the guidance of both chaplains and educational officers on this important subject more effective. I lack official data in regard to our own army, but such evidence as I was able to gather informally gave me the impression that there is little in the way of sex guidance between the chaplain's rather too simple prohibitions and the medical officer's rather too simple prophylaxis.

An army fighting for democracy without a full opportunity to discuss the meaning of the struggle in which it is engaged may easily become a peril to democracy. This is true because army techniques and procedures are highly specialized; and all highly specialized preoccupations are a potential peril to a form of government that requires for its preservation broad perspectives and an understanding of ultimate issues. It is natural for field officers to be skeptical of, and on occasion inimical to, democratic education in the army. They naturally fear any distraction which might beguile the soldier from his immediate task. But it is precisely because military discipline conduces to a narrow outlook that democracy insists upon the subordination of military to civil authority. In the field of education, this subordination has not been preserved in the United States Army. The American soldier has Hollywood, in both the literal and symbolic sense, to fill his leisure hours; but he lacks help in finding the spiritual and moral significance of the titanic struggle in which he is engaged. We may one day rue this neglect of the substance of democracy in democracy's army.

In the Wind

CHESTER BOWLES is doing a good job as head of the OPA, says *Printers' Ink*, a magazine devoted to "advertising, management, and sales." However, "he is having his troubles in trying to persuade competent business men to take over the key jobs. . . . It is a perfectly amazing situation when business men will, in effect, deliberately turn their Washington affairs over to the much maligned professors and the choice assortment of crackpots with which OPA is infested."

POSTERS announcing Leon Henderson's forthcoming series of talks on a radio program sponsored by O'Sullivan's Heels present a picture of Mr. Henderson directly above the slogan, "America's Number One Heel."

THE BRESLEE Manufacturing Company, which produces war materials, not only hires, pays, and promotes Negroes on the same basis as whites, but is encouraging its employees to think about the issues involved in the war by offering a \$25 war bond for the best letter on the subject, "What I Am Fighting For."

GERALD L. K. SMITH, leader of the America First Party, on the split in the Republican Party: "If Congressmen Hoffman, Woodruff, Bradley, and Shafer have their way in shaping the policy of the Republican Party next year, there will be no need of an America First Party."

JO SERRA, editor of the Skokie, Illinois, *Press*, explains the Four Freedoms to people outside the United States: "The Four Freedoms, folks, is just a slogan—something to get our mind off of something else. . . . But, you folks in foreign lands, you should not take us too serious, anyway coming election year. We have some odd and unique ways of trying to intrigue our voters."

A FEW MONTHS AGO American Airlines was placing institutional advertising on the theme, "Either we will be dominant in the air or we will be dominated in the post-war world." Today, still over the signature of its president, A. N. Kemp, it issues the message: "Air Is International. . . . The post-war air program must be predicated upon agreements between nations."

FESTUNG EUROPA: On the evening of the bombing of Rome the Nazi-controlled radio station at Oslo canceled its regular news report and played musical recordings instead. The first record was a song, "No Sour Faces." . . . A number of articles written by Slovak Quislings have complained that many Slovak scientists no longer seem interested in publishing the results of their researches. The newspaper *Slovak* says, "We hardly know how to explain the strange silence of some of our scientists."

[We invite our readers to submit material for *In the Wind*—either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. A prize of \$5 will be awarded each month for the best item.—EDITORS THE NATION.]

The Last Hour

THE sixth meeting between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill takes place in an atmosphere of unlimited confidence, with good news pouring in from every military front. If the conference has been greeted not with unanimous joy but with a general feeling of skepticism, it is because our deep satisfaction in the impending doom of the Axis cannot preclude our concern over the political developments of the war. Until now we have had a political setback for every military achievement, and the disparity grows more apparent as the victorious armies draw closer to their goal.

The Italian crisis is the most immediate issue facing the conference. Recently, perhaps in a mood of summer irresponsibility, a high Allied dignitary remarked that the Italian state of affairs concerned military staffs exclusively. It cannot be assumed that the President and the Prime Minister share this view. It would be interesting to know whether, in the intimacy of the conversations between the two leaders, Mr. Churchill has shown himself as well satisfied with the manner in which the Italian crisis has been handled in Washington and London as official circles would pretend.

Here in the United States we have indulged in a good deal of self-deception. Even commentators who did not spare their criticism in discussing the blunders committed in North Africa were prompt to say that no better action could have been taken in Italy, and that to speak of the creation of a free Italian government, opposed to the King and Badoglio, was both childish and dangerous. People in London seem to know better. Authoritative voices have revealed growing uneasiness as Italy has continued to play the German game, and they have marked the loss of a magnificent opportunity for the United Nations, with the help of the Italian people, to rouse the anti-fascist masses of Europe.

Judging by authentic reports which trickle out of Italy, the popular movement against the war and against the King and Badoglio, the reaction to the farce of dissolving fascism by law even while securing its power, has reached an extraordinary intensity. What would have been the effect upon the masses demonstrating in Milan and Turin if real anti-fascist Italians had addressed them from Sicily? Perhaps the leaders at the Anglo-American conference feel satisfied that their chief objective has been attained—the preservation of order and the avoidance of revolution. But not even Mr. Churchill's fertile imagination can make a political success out of a situation created by the lack of a clear democratic policy.

As in all the previous Churchill-Roosevelt conferences, Russia will be "kept fully informed" of all decisions, and that, regrettably, will be the extent of its participation. It was made to appear after the earlier meetings in Washington and Casablanca that everything pointed to a perfect agreement among the United Nations. After the landing in Sicily even the controversial issue of a second front seemed to be settled. But it is now evident that the only road to a genuine accord is acceptance of the Russian interpretation of a second front.

The differences between the Soviet Union, the United States, and Great Britain may be slighter than they were some months ago. But it is not encouraging to hear the people who a year ago talked of the possibility of a separate Russo-German peace emerging again with the same argument. Nor is it a sign of genuine collaboration among the three great powers that the creation of a Free German Committee in Moscow has inspired diverse schemes to outwit the Russians in Berlin.

The Soviet Union has three complaints against its Western allies: military commitments made but not fulfilled; delay in the recognition of the French Committee of National Liberation; assumption that the military and civil administration of Italian occupied territories, beginning with Sicily, is a purely American-British affair.

Of the three problems, the second was the easiest to solve. The Russians simply served notice that if the Algiers committee were not recognized by Britain and the United States in the near future, the Soviet government would take such action on its own account. A belated victory was won—but not before the prestige of Washington had sadly fallen, and not before the status of General de Gaulle had become almost a question of American national honor.

Russia may eventually be fully satisfied on the other two issues. But there will be further problems out of which major divergencies among the United Nations may arise. As long as the problems are aggravated by mutual rivalry and distrust, we shall emerge from one crisis only to enter another. Now, at this advanced stage of the war, the London *Observer* finds it necessary to urge the creation of a political council of the United Nations and to warn that this is the last hour to unite. For two years this has been the constant plea of everyone with enough imagination to foresee a certain military victory and an almost certain political defeat. Every plea proved useless. The United Nations were strong. One day the irresistible force of Allied armies would force the Axis to its knees,

and anything said in regard to the political aspect of the struggle was sheer impertinence and a hindrance to the war effort.

But the problems remained. They will either be accorded a politically adequate solution or all the 21 million tons of American shipping announced for 1944, all the fabulous production of planes and tanks, and all the richness of the arsenal of democracy will be insufficient to bring peace on earth. The status quo among the United Nations cannot be maintained indefinitely by intermittent smiles and reproaches. The choice is between an immediate unity of Russia, the United States, and Great Britain on political strategy and war aims, or eventual open conflict.

J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO

Mr. Hull's Bad Dream

BY PAUL WINKLER

THE French Committee of National Liberation held a meeting in Algiers today, deliberating whether it should recognize the State Department as a body representing American interests. General Giraud defended the point of view that though there was no necessity for a so-called "full recognition," it should seriously be taken into consideration whether the State Department did not deserve a "provisional recognition," or at least a "de facto recognition."

General de Gaulle said that the State Department could not be recognized by the committee because, according to confidential information he had received, the source of which he could not reveal, "there was no State Department" and consequently it could not be said yet with certainty whether there was a United States of America at all. He added that according to Dr. Gallup 95 per cent of the Americans were not for the State Department and to regard as representative of American interests a body which has behind it only 5 per cent of all Americans was quite impossible.

General Giraud answered that, according to his figures, 95 per cent of all Americans were backing the State Department. Asked to explain where he got his figures, Giraud said he was not quite sure whether they were from the *Fortune* poll or the Gettysburg Address, and added that the latter document was, from what he had heard, of great importance for Americans and should always be mentioned by anyone speaking about American affairs.

The State Department, M. André Philip then proposed, should be told first to achieve unity among its own leaders before applying for any recognition. From reliable American newspaper reports, he could announce that Mr. Cordell Hull did not get along well with Mr. Sumner Welles and did not like Mr. Adolf Berle; Mr. Sumner Welles did not like Mr. Hull and Mr. Berle;

and Mr. Berle liked only himself. M. René Massigli, speaking about Mr. Berle, said that a man who, according to American magazines, has two tubs in his bathroom cannot be regarded as a representative statesman anyhow.

M. André Philip then submitted to the meeting a confidential message which he had just received through underground channels from Washington. According to this message, it was certain that Mr. Roosevelt was either a Fascist or a Communist, but it was not yet clear which. Some Americans insisted that the OWI and the FCC were full of Communists, and others that the State Department was full of Fascists, and because these offices had been created by President Roosevelt there was a good chance that he might be both Fascist and Communist. M. Philip understood that a secret debate on this subject was just going on between Representative Martin Dies and Miss Elsa Maxwell.

M. André Philip then asked how the State Department could seriously ask for recognition so long as its policies were determined entirely by a man who is both Fascist and Communist. General Giraud intervened and said that he was surprised to learn that President Roosevelt should be described as determining the foreign policies of the State Department. He had always thought that the President and the Department had separate foreign policies, which fact he regarded as an outstanding example of that marvelous principle of "division of powers" which is so well defined in one of the basic charters of American democracy, probably the Gettysburg Address.

Mr. Arthur Krock was then cited by M. Philip as his source of information regarding the determination of State Department policies by President Roosevelt. M. Massigli asked whether the committee should not issue a statement that it looked upon such a situation as denoting "personal ambitions" on the part of President Roosevelt and refuse recognition on these grounds. General Giraud, speaking about Mr. Krock, who had been mentioned by M. Philip, proposed that his name should be acclaimed by the committee, together with those of Messrs. Harold Callender and Ernest K. Lindley, as those of three sincere friends of France and Franco-American collaboration. General de Gaulle said that he would have to think this over and suggested that the matter be discussed again at the next meeting.

General Giraud expressed regrets that such an important question should not be discussed immediately and said that he could categorically refute the accusation leveled against President Roosevelt that he pursued his personal policies in foreign political matters, because, as far at least as French matters were concerned, he was certain that the President listened to the advice of Admiral Leahy, a friend of France and a close friend of Marshal Pétain and of Harry Hopkins, a much-traveled gentleman. For all these reasons it was unjust to accuse

President Roosevelt of "dictatorial tendencies" and to refuse the recognition of his State Department on these grounds. He added that he knew for certain that wherever President Roosevelt went he left a "trail of Franco-philia" behind him. As a source for this information, he quoted a confidential report by Mr. Churchill given to him for his exclusive personal use.

General de Gaulle then summed up the debate, saying that though he was not in favor of a "full" recognition, nor of a "provisional" recognition, nor of a "de facto" recognition, he would take into consideration a fourth category: recognition as an "ally," for which there was some precedent during the Thirty Years' War, which he promised to submit to the next meeting. He said that he would propose this recognition merely in consideration of the fact that General Eisenhower was being maintained as chief of the American army in Europe, but he still did not like the idea that President Roosevelt as commander-in-chief of the American army should unite in his hands both military and political powers.

Behind the Enemy Line

BY ARGUS

ONE of Germany's troubles is its young people. There are fanatical believers in Nazism among them, but there are also those who oppose it. Professor von Gruneberg, a hundred-per-cent Nazi, seems to think the latter predominate. In an article in the *Preussische Zeitung* of July 20 he complained that youth shows an alarming "indifference." Over and over again he tolled the bell on this note:

The younger generation lacks the balance of the older people, who know that the years since 1933 have been their salvation. Therefore, young people are necessarily quite indifferent to both the great successes and the present critical hours of the war. The rapid succession of important events in their early youth has made them less susceptible to enthusiasm.

But the Nazi professor is not always so circumlocutory. Of the university students he says bluntly, "They are tired of the political conception of life and are seeking private intellectual satisfaction." He confesses that it makes him "shudder to think that they will some day hold responsible positions in German society."

The scarcity of manufactured goods is illustrated every day by new examples.

On July 27 in Flensburg, a town near the Danish border, every household which rented an electric oven from the electric company was ordered to turn it in. A proclamation by the mayor said the ovens were to be given up without delay because they were "needed im-

mediately" (possibly in the near-by city of Hamburg).

On July 31 the official news agency, DNB, released this announcement:

The Reich Health Leader has issued an order that all members of the medical profession, especially doctors and dentists using X-ray equipment, must register their equipment with the Reich Defense Commissary.

Such registration is always followed by requisitioning.

On August 1 and 2 the Berlin correspondent of the Swedish newspaper, *Social-Demokraten*, announced that ration cards for textile products of all kinds had been annulled throughout Germany. This was done in order to reserve all supplies on hand for air-raid victims who have lost everything. Dresses, trousers, underwear, hats, sheets, etc., can no longer be bought in Germany. Exceptions are made—aside from air-raid victims—only for children and expectant mothers. Sentiment, however, is not forgotten. Relatives of those who have died in air raids and in battle are permitted to buy mourning.

A leaflet, of which thousands of copies were distributed in Berlin after the fall of Mussolini, has already been mentioned in dispatches to the American press. The Berlin correspondent of the Stockholm *Aftontidningen* reported on August 3 that the Gestapo was feverishly but unsuccessfully trying to track down the producers and distributors of the leaflet. The text, as published in *Aftontidningen*, is as follows:

IMAGINE THIS!

Goebbels's radio and press minimize the revolutionary events in Italy. They say that it is only a change of government, that it is entirely an internal Italian matter, and that the war will continue. We can, however, get a clearer insight into the events and be better able to grasp what happened if we try to project them on to the background of German conditions.

Imagine workers in Berlin, Hamburg, and all other major cities of the Reich stopping work, filling the streets, and shouting, "We want peace!" Imagine Hitler trying to avoid catastrophe by resigning his post and withdrawing to Berchtesgaden. Imagine officers and soldiers declaring their solidarity with rebellious workers, all the offices of the party and of party officials closing down, and the extirpation of Nazism. Imagine Göring, Himmler, Goebbels, and all the others arrested and locked up, and excited masses breaking into the houses and palaces of the Nazi dogs and distributing their hoarded food stuffs among the people. Imagine the editor in chief of the *Völkischer Beobachter* arrested and the newspaper suddenly appearing as a democratic organ. Imagine hundreds and thousands of people asking the Gestapo to release prisoners, imagine this demand fulfilled and the members of the Gestapo taken to concentration camps.

Imagine all this, and you will know what really happened in Italy.

BOOKS and the ARTS

The Preacher Sought to Find Out Acceptable Words

They drop with periodic regularity
From the summit of their goodness, young, to death.
They leap to the blue
And it is out of the blue
Comes Death the Enemy.

Some young flier
When he least expected it slips,
Before he ever got into combat, in a training plane,
Before a backdrop of high-puffed, idealistic clouds,
Towering, still, complete, high, like all his dreams,
In luminous heat of sweaty Pensacola.

Closeness to machines going fast gives man brazenness,
Lags him back to brute-heart: who should be
Full of moral imperatives does what he is told,
Is cheerful, counts not the cost, gets in his licks.

The fine body needing no thought, working perfectly,
Has to be discounted, hands capable:
Least likely to do when
Seeing the superiority of the airman's eye
(Unsupplanted by scholarship)
Tools of justice high in the air!

One, to marry tomorrow, dead today,
Broaches the rude history of the world,
This descendant from the sky and man;

While we watched him pulsing with the others,
A painted ship upon a painted sky,
Diverted from swimming a moment when he dropped.

RICHARD EBERHART

Mr. Moul't's "Majority"

THE BEST POEMS OF 1942. Selected by Thomas Moul't.
Harcourt, Brace and Company. \$2.

MR. MOULT, in an introduction that celebrates the twenty-first year of this annual series, declares that, in spite of criticism, he persists in the adjective "best." An editor, he says, must have the courage of his convictions. So far so good; and, of course, every man to his taste. Every man to his taste; but to exploit and advertise a certain kind of taste over two full decades may be not so much courageous as plain foolhardy. For the effort is nonsensical if the reader lacks confidence in the editor's judgment; this failing, neither years nor poets can be properly esteemed. It is pertinent, therefore, to subject Mr. Moul't's competence to a little further inquiry.

The authors of what Mr. Moul't claims to be the best poems

of 1942 are approximately sixty in number, divided about evenly between British and Americans, with a sprinkling of Canadians and Irish. There are no South Africans, Australians, or New Zealanders. The best known English names are those of De la Mare, Masfield, Blunden, Shanks, Gogarty, and Spender. (The poems of the last two, by the way, appeared in American periodicals). The best known American names are those of David Morton, who appears three times, more than any other poet in the book, Babette Deutsch, Conrad Aiken, Richard Eberhart, and Oscar Williams. At the same time, there are a lot of poets like Joseph Auslander, Tom Boggs, Stanton A. Coblentz, Anderson M. Scruggs, and Harold Vinal. Not only a lot of poets like these, but also their very selves, in person.

On the other hand, T. S. Eliot, apparently, did not write one of the best poems of 1942. When were "East Coker" and "The Dry Salvages" first published? Neither did W. H. Auden have any such luck, nor George Barker, Louis MacNeice, W. R. Rodgers (whose book is advertised by the publishers on the reverse jacket), nor Dylan Thomas. Neither, in Canada, did Raymond Knister, A. M. Klein, nor A. J. M. Smith.

On our side of the border, it is easy to think of many others. Neither of the Benéts appears, nor does Frost, nor Sandburg, nor MacLeish. John Crowe Ransom is not here, nor is Allen Tate, nor R. P. Blackmur, nor R. P. Warren, nor Yvor Winters. Karl Shapiro is not here, nor is any of the four poets who were this year awarded Guggenheim fellowships. Neither is Randall Jarrell, nor Horace Gregory (both on the Harcourt list). Neither is Kenneth Fearing, nor Langston Hughes. Neither is Theodore Roethke, nor W. T. Scott. Neither is William Carlos Williams; neither is Marya Zaturenska. You will probably think of others, gentle readers. Is not all this something of a shock? And is not my list long enough to demonstrate that I am not merely caviling at the absence of my personal favorites?

Let us next consider the places where Mr. Moul't has found the best poems. Most of the English poems are taken from London publications: Mr. Moul't's favorite, by long odds, is a magazine called the *Listener*, from which he has taken nine poems, more than twice as many as he has culled from any other single area. The London publications include the *Sunday Times*, *Adelphi*, *English*, the *Observer*, the *New Statesman and Nation*, *Poetry Review*, the *New English Weekly*, *Horizon*, *Time and Tide*, and the *Nineteenth Century and After* (though not much after, I would risk a small bet). The *Queen's Quarterly*, in Toronto, has yielded two specimens, one the longest in the book; the *Canadian Quarterly* another. The *Dublin Magazine* is the source of two poems, and *Jongleur*, published in Bradford, Yorkshire, yields one.

Whereas in England Mr. Moul't seems, in his eclecticism, inclined to be a townie, his American impulses are much more provincial. The *Lyric* (Norfolk, Virginia), *Wings* (Mill Valley, California), *Poetry Forum* (Baltimore),

Fantasy (Pittsburgh), *talaria* (Cincinnati), *Prairie Schooner* (Lincoln, Nebraska), *Contemporary Poetry* (Baltimore again), the *Tramp* (Anacortes, Washington), *Kaleidograph* (Dallas)—these testify to his range. How he managed to miss something called the *American Weave* is a mystery to me. He could hardly have missed *Poetry* (Chicago), or the *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston), though in each instance he came mighty close, taking one poem from each. He also got in something from the *Saturday Evening Post* (Philadelphia), and the *Virginia Quarterly Review* (Charlottesville). He did not find very much in New York: four items from *Voices*, his American favorite; two from *Spirit*, one each from the *New York Times*, the *Saturday Review of Literature*, *Decision*, and *Common Sense*. *The Nation* had a narrow escape, just getting under the wire with the last poem in the book, *One Morning the World Woke Up*, by Oscar Williams.

Mr. Moulton found nothing to qualify in the pages of *Harper's* or the *American Mercury*; nothing in the *New Masses*, the *New Republic*, the *New Yorker*; nothing in the *Kenyon Review*, the *Southern Review*, the *Southwestern Review*, the *Yale Review*, or *Partisan Review*. He did not discover, in his continental roamings, either the poetry column conducted by W. T. Scott in the *Providence Journal* (which paid poets, by the way), or the extensive department of poetry edited by Alan Swallow in the *New Mexico Quarterly*. Perhaps this would be asking too much; but if a man can find *talaria*, and the *Tramp*, wouldn't you think—?

Now let us have a look at the best poems themselves, remembering that those published in 1942 were written some time earlier. You would have a hard time proving, from these pages, that there was a war on; the event is mentioned, described, or alluded to, in less than a dozen items. That the war neither scares nor interests poets might be a healthy sign; as it is surely one that neither the official line nor private bloodthirstiness do any loud shrieking in these pages. On the other hand, the trouble is, these writers seem to have no strong feelings, either for, against, or about the whole bloody business: Oscar Williams's poem, Stephen Spender's phrase, "where everything stops but the wishes that kill," and the sensitive remarks of David Morton in the sonnet entitled *Lost Lexicon* are exceptions to the general rule. For the most part, the treatment is casual or conventional: the familiar, the inevitable airplane-and-bomb make their appearance, of course. The men of the infantry and artillery are going to get little notice from literature this time, it seems.

If not the war in particular, do the anxieties, fears, doubts, confusions of our times in general, then, reveal themselves in the work of these writers? Oh, not at all; they are a most untroubled lot. What *do* they write about? They write about stars in their steadfast course in heaven; about horses ploughing fields; about hawks in the height of air, and other birds, preferably curlews, hovering around hedgerows; about quaint old people inhabiting houses; about harebells and all-heal; about beauty being memorable; about young girls sleeping, and the foam of dreams. In short, the best poems of 1942 might just as well be those of 1912, and who would be any the wiser? It is not a question of the subjects mentioned above being the timeless stuff of poetry, either; what counts is the insight with which they are seen, the emotion with which they are felt, the skill with which that emotion is

communicated, the vigor and freshness with which their tradition is maintained, the music with which they are made anew. No, what we have here is not timelessness, but stick-in-the-mud Georgianism; and it is for this sort of thing that Mr. Moulton's taste yearns. It is this sort of thing he has an infallible ability to discover, whether it has to be fished up from some curious little back-eddy in the heart of London, or from the shallow ponds of the American provinces.

No, Mr. Moulton, no, no. Nobody, save yourself and a few, perhaps, of your less sophisticated contributors will believe, really, that these are the best poems of 1942. I am sure better poems were written, and published, in 1942 than most of these, and—let us be fair—so, no doubt, were many that were worse. And my own hunch is that during the forties better poems were and are being written than were and are being published, and that these will, eventually, come to light, though it may not be till some time after the duration.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES

The Falange—An Axis Tool

FALANGE: THE 'AXIS SECRET' ARMY IN THE AMERICAS. By Allan Chase. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$3.

I SUPPOSE it was inevitable that the publishers of Allan Chase's "Falange" should stress the more sensational charges of this extraordinarily well documented study of Spanish fascism and the way it has served the Axis in its fight against the democracies. On the front of the book's jacket is the challenging statement that it presents "proof that over a million trained enemies of the United States are now actively engaged in undercover warfare in both North and South America." And on the back are twenty provocative questions, the answers to which, within the book itself, leave no doubt as to the role that Germany is playing in using the Falange as a powerful weapon against us.

And yet, detailed as are Mr. Chase's proofs of spying, sabotage, and anti-democratic propaganda in the Philippines, Latin America, and the United States itself, his story of the willingness of thousands of reactionaries everywhere to sacrifice the interests of their own country or people to their personal advantage or class loyalty is infinitely more sickening.

The importance of Mr. Chase's story lies not so much in why the Philippine Falange was decorated by Japan after the fall of Manila or who took photos of American naval bases in Panama and sent them to Germany as in the record of the complacency with which our diplomatic representatives abroad viewed the traitorous activities of those who financed and led the Falange.

In the Philippines it was the old Spanish aristocracy that stood back of it. "Sons of wealthy Spanish planters and colonial traders," says Mr. Chase, "they had, as boys or youths, emotionally or physically fought to keep the archipelago within the Spanish empire during the Spanish-American War. Trained from childhood to hate the freedom of peoples, the freedom of religions, and the freedom of education, they had within their own lifetime seen all three freedoms develop in the Philippines."

And they didn't like it. It was understandable enough that

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER!

A Copy of the First Edition of

New Poems: 1943

An Anthology of British and American Verse
edited by **Oscar Williams**

CONTRIBUTORS:

- CONRAD AIKEN
- W. H. AUDEN
- GEORGE BARKER
- R. P. BLACKMUR
- J. M. BRINNIN
- E. E. CUMMINGS
- RICHARD EBERHART
- WILLIAM EMPSON
- ROBERT FROST
- ROBERT GRAVES
- RANDALL JARRELL
- ROBINSON JEFFERS
- C. DAY LEWIS
- ARCHIBALD MacLEISH
- LOUIS MacNEICE
- MARIANNE MOORE
- FREDERIC PROKOSCH
- HERBERT READ
- MURIEL RUKEYSER
- DELMORE SCHWARTZ
- EDITH SITWELL
- STEPHEN SPENDER
- WALLACE STEVENS
- ALLEN TATE
- DYLAN THOMAS
- DUNSTAN THOMPSON
- MARK VAN DOREN
- OSCAR WILLIAMS
- YVOR WINTERS

and others

containing the best and latest work of the important American and English poets, as well as the work of a number of new and exciting talents. As in the past, the 1943 book contains a section devoted to photographs of the contributors. Also many poems by such poets as Wallace Stevens, E. E. Cummings, etc., are here printed for the first time, making the book a fine 1st edition item. That Mr. Williams is an able editor with a high standard has been proven by the acclaim of leading critics for his last two collections in this series. The previous anthologies were listed by *The Nation* among the "notable books" for 1941 and 1942. The present volume, the best of the three, is a "must" for every lover of modern poetry.

REGULAR PRICE \$2.75

and

A year to THE NATION . . . \$5.00

Total \$7.75

both for \$6.50

USE THE COUPON

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N. Y.
Please send me a year's subscription to THE NATION beginning with the issue, and a copy of NEW POEMS, 1943, Anthology, edited by Oscar Williams. Enclosed find \$6.50.

Name

Address

they should not, if you know anything about the education of an upper-class Spaniard. It was logical, too, that they were eager to support a fascist revolution in a republican Spain where their investments were threatened and their profits curtailed. That they understood the nature of fascism far better than our diplomats abroad was clearly shown by their eagerness to keep up the work of the Falange even after the Spanish Republic had been destroyed. What is not so easily understood is why we stood by and permitted them to build their Falange without let or hindrance.

In the Philippines, Mr. Chase reveals, it was the Falange which sabotaged civilian defense. In Puerto Rico, our Gibraltar of the Caribbean, he adds, "the Falange and its most important supporters appear in high places."

The story of the Falange in the United States is too familiar to need repeating. The tragedy was that so many Americans allowed their economic or religious loyalties to blind them to the threat that Spanish fascism held for America. Many among them today must squirm at the memory of how they were duped by such Franco apologists as Jane Anderson, once described by Monsignor Fulton Sheen of the Catholic University as "one of the martyrs" of history and today under indictment for treason as Berlin's "Lady Haw Haw."

The post-Spanish-civil-war Falange presents a problem that is peculiarly American. It has flourished in those countries where Spanish colonial influence was once dominant, countries which, in one way or another, touch us closely. Mr. Chase's charges therefore cannot be ignored. Basing his demand on Mr. Chase's book, Representative John Coffee has asked for a Congressional investigation of the Spanish Falange. It would be incredible if such an investigation should be refused by a Congress that has voted hundreds of thousands of dollars to finance the antics of Representative Dies.

Mr. Chase has an annoying habit of dramatizing events and conversations in a manner that strains credibility a little, but he can be forgiven this fault for his magnificent last chapter, which tears to pieces the miserable policy the United States has followed in Spain since the outbreak of the revolution in 1936. It is a curious fact that, though more than one high official in Washington will tell you that our refusal to sell arms to Republican Spain for fear of offending Hitler and Mussolini was a horrible blunder, still they do nothing to correct that blunder. Even today we continue to appease Franco, and Mr. Chase's wrath is a pleasure to anyone who saw the stricken look that came into the eyes of Spanish Republicans in Madrid when they knew, finally, that we had betrayed them.

His conclusion, therefore, is too sound to be missed:

If it was dangerous to appease fascism in 1936, it is a thousand times more perilous today. For the fascist cancer has more than merely brought death to Spain itself; it has, in the form of Falangismo, spread to Manila, to Latin America, to the United States of America. Spain has become the base headquarters of the greatest Axis fifth column in the Western Hemisphere, a fifth column that will not be smashed until fascism is destroyed on the entire Iberian peninsula.

ALEXANDER UHL

The Making of a State

MASARYK IN ENGLAND. By R. W. Seton-Watson. The Macmillan Company. \$2.75.

SINCE the time of Protagoras, whose dictum, "Man is the measure," laid the foundation of humanism, there have been but few great Western philosophers, like Erasmus of Rotterdam or Janus Comenius, like John Locke or Tom Paine, whose political doctrine centered upon the humanistic ideal. Still fewer the statesmen whose policies were rooted in humanism rather than in religious or nationalistic ideas. Thomas G. Masaryk was incontestably an outstanding representative of both types. Unfortunately he stood almost alone in the nationalistic wilderness of Europe between two world wars.

Professor Seton-Watson, Masaryk's friend for a quarter of a century and, with Wickham Steed, his sponsor in British political life, sums up a masterfully terse biographical sketch in the following sentence: "Masaryk was a great thinker . . . a great patriot to whom patriotism was never enough in itself, and to whom the brotherhood of man was a legacy from his own national past; a constructive statesman . . . also the most human of rulers, who radiated dignity and benevolence."

In the first half of his book the author gives a full account of Masaryk's activities in England from April, 1915, when he arrived in London, traveling as an exile on a Serbian passport and exciting the suspicion of the British police, until November, 1918, when the Grenadier Guards gave him as President-elect the royal salute at Victoria Station. It was six months before this arrival that the sixty-eight-year-old ex-professor of philosophy was leading the anabasis of 70,000 Czech and Slovak legionnaires via Siberia to Vladivostok. All this time London, the political center of the Allies, was Masaryk's headquarters. Although it was due to his direct and indirect influence at the White House that "the Dual Monarchy crumbled before the impact of Wilsonian diplomacy," yet Britain was first to recognize Czechoslovakia as an Allied and belligerent nation. This dénouement was the result of Masaryk's manifold relentless agility, into which his letters to the author, first published in this volume, supply an interesting insight. Chapter III contains Masaryk's confidential memorandum on Bohemia to the Foreign Office, also hitherto unpublished.

While Masaryk was writing memoranda, contributing to the magazine *New Europe*, on the publication of which he insisted, and lecturing to the School of Slavonic Studies, his devoted follower, Dr. Benes, then in Paris, efficiently collaborated. Haters of democracy have developed a Czechophobia which leads them to contrast Masaryk, the "philosopher king," with Benes, who is portrayed as an incurable imperialist. Professor Seton-Watson aptly insists therefore "upon the absolute harmony of views, alike in the theory and the practice of foreign policy, between the two men." Benes's unique position for twenty years "was due in the first instance to Masaryk's resolute support against every intrigue."

"Masaryk in England" presents but a short chapter in the president-liberator's rich and eventful life, but certainly a significant one. President Benes is facing now a situation similar to that which confronted Masaryk after recognition

Which Men's Shoes Are Best Buys?

- Must You Pay High Prices to Get Good Shoes?
- Should You Spend \$3? \$5? \$10? \$22?

. . . These are some of the questions answered by one of the important war-time projects completed by Consumers Union.

The highest priced shoes tested—\$22.50—were not the best quality, CU technicians found. If you know which brands to buy, you can get better shoes for a third to half the price.

CU's report on men's shoes, based on laboratory tests of 143 pairs of shoes of 33 leading brands, tells which brands were found to be of highest quality regardless of price; which brands at different price levels were considered to be the best buys, both price and quality considered.

You can get the shoe report free, by entering your subscription now to CU publications. A year's subscription will bring you, in addition to the issue containing the shoe report, the 384-page

ANNUAL BUYING GUIDE, with brand-name ratings of hundreds of items you buy from day to day;

CONSUMER REPORTS, CU's monthly publication, containing up-to-the-minute ratings of consumer goods, plus valuable advice on health, nutrition and other consumer problems;

BREAD & BUTTER, the 4-page news weekly of consumer action.

USE THE COUPON BELOW

CONSUMERS UNION

17 Union Square, New York 3, N. Y.

I enclose \$4. Please send me *Bread & Butter* and *Consumer Reports*, including the *Annual Buying Guide* issue, for one year. Also send the issue containing the report on men's shoes.

Name

Address

Na 1

COWARD?
WALK-OVER?
MCAN?
FLORSHEIM?
STETSON?
BECK?
SHRINER?
REGAL?
NUNN-BUSH?
DOUGLAS?
LONDON?
WARD?
HANAN?

by the Allies. His case is being supported, however, by a new and strong argument: twenty years of Czechoslovak history have borne witness to the true democratic and social spirit of the republic. However, the weight and moment of this argument largely depend on the ability of the victorious statesmen to share Masaryk's belief that "Jesus, not Caesar, is the meaning of history."

RUSTEM VAMBERY

Concerning the Peace

TOWARDS AN ABIDING PEACE. By R. M. MacIver.
The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

IN THIS summer of 1943, when post-war planning has become the daily fare of ad writers and platform speakers, a new book about peace finds the reviewer weary and suspicious. But "Towards an Abiding Peace" is not just another peace book. Far from it: it is probably the best book of this kind that has appeared in years. Dr. MacIver, who is neither a wild-eyed dreamer nor a self-styled expert—he is a Columbia University sociologist—goes at his subject with the wisdom of a trained social scientist and the fervor of an out-and-out democrat. In noble and hard-hitting prose, he tells us what peace is and how we can get it. With inescapable logic, peace is shown to depend upon international law, international law upon international police, and international police upon national disarmament. "So long as any state owns for its exclusive purposes a single cruiser or a single battery of heavy guns, the establishment of international law is still unattained."

Peace, then, means above all the gradual reduction of national armament. It means also, according to Dr. MacIver's persuasive analysis, the internationalization of colonies and strategic waterways, the quick readoption of defeated enemy countries into the family of nations, and the abandonment of the idea of independent national sovereignty. It means many other important and intelligent things that fill this short volume to the brim and make it something like a compendium of liberal post-war thinking. Between the two emerging schools of thought—political versus economic, international versus domestic, global versus regional solutions—Dr. MacIver takes a stand for political internationalism and makes an excellent case for it. Also, having the advantage of being late in the game, he can answer other writers before him: he has disapproval for Adamic, admiration for Ferrero, doubts about Carr, and a smile for Culbertson. To writers like Walter Lippmann he has this to say: "It should be the special role of America to make certain that calculations of future strategy . . . shall be banned from the next peace table."

In short, the book is proof that the problem of lasting peace is not necessarily an assignment for cranks. But does that mean that abiding peace is "a quite attainable goal," as the blurb assures us? Dr. MacIver insists that his ideas are not utopian but practical. But he himself says that "the genuine business" of the statesman and the economist is not with such questions as how private enterprise can be saved or how socialism can be achieved. It is rather with questions of this kind: "How can economic opportunity be more widely and more equally distributed? How can unemployment be

avoided and at what cost? How can a minimum standard of economic welfare be assured to all? How can the disastrous cycle of economic advance and retreat be mitigated and controlled? How can the remarkable advances of technology be translated into greater general prosperity?" Very good. But, by the same token, is the question how world peace can be attained "the genuine business" of a statesman? Isn't this, too, one of the wrong questions to ask? Isn't it true, in politics also, that the great ideals are achieved by way of humble devotion to specific tasks? Maybe Dr. MacIver shouldn't have wasted his time and scientific training in writing this admirable book.

RUDOLF FLESCH

Shakespeare's Text

THE EDITORIAL PROBLEM IN SHAKESPEARE: A SURVEY OF THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE TEXT.
By W. W. Greg. Oxford University Press. \$3.75.

SINCE 1900 a revolution has been effected in most departments of our knowledge of Shakespeare's work, but nowhere has it been more startling and decisive than in the traditional views of his text. When certain English scholars—A. W. Pollard, E. K. Chambers, R. B. McKerrow, W. W. Greg—began work about forty years ago, textual study appeared to have reached a dead end. It was thought that the great Cambridge edition of 1863-66 had done as much as was possible to recover what Shakespeare wrote from the early texts of his plays, so depraved and so far removed from his originals; lucky emendation might clear up for us a few more passages, but the damage on the whole had been done too long ago, the originals had disappeared, and the corruption was irreparable. Into this gloom came men with new methods, the methods of what is called critical bibliography. The Quarto editions of plays published during Shakespeare's lifetime, long depreciated, were classified into "good" and "bad" groups, and most of the "good" ones, as well as the eighteen plays first printed in the Folio of 1623, were shown to rest on authority—on autograph manuscripts or on prompt-copies from the company for which he wrote. Untiring research accumulated knowledge concerning theatrical conditions, manuscripts, companies, methods of abridging and "reporting" plays, publishers, the printing house, the descent of editions, Elizabethan spelling and punctuation, Elizabethan handwriting. An addition in the manuscript play "Sir Thomas More," in the British Museum, has even been proved—one can now say—to be in Shakespeare's hand. The essential integrity of his text has been vindicated. An editor's judgment must be based henceforward on a decision as to the nature of the copy which was used for the Quarto and Folio texts before him; since materials for a decision are available, despair has given way to a spirit of "restrained optimism." The importance of this knowledge to the reader of Shakespeare will be clear when he is told, for instance, that his copy of "King Lear" is riddled with readings from the inferior Quarto of 1608 and even from the worthless reprint of 1619, some four-fifths of which are almost certainly wrong. In nearly all modern editions, critical and casual, a single passage of nine lines (1:1, 151-9) contains five or six or seven of which perhaps one is justified.

To all this work Dr. Greg has contributed heavily, and his Clark Lectures of 1939, here printed with documentation and commentary, form the best record of its results that has appeared. Indeed, a more authoritative exposition is inconceivable. If it can be proper to discriminate between the general attitudes of scholars and bibliographers, all so cautious, and if a political analogy is permissible, the pioneers might be ranged as follows: McKerrow, Royalist; Chambers, right center; Pollard, left center (were Dover Wilson admitted to this rare company he would stand still further to the left). Greg stands, I believe, directly in the center. His scholarship for forty years has been as ambitious and original as it has been careful, and his accuracy is proverbial among Shakespearean students. This book would be indispensable if it merely assembled his main conclusions from his other books and essays. But it displays some of them as altered; the whole problem of editorial decision is studied at length; the principal work of his colleagues is passed in scrupulous review; much new evidence is presented; and stage directions especially are pressed everywhere for their last suggestiveness—at this sort of analysis it is doubtful whether Greg has a peer even in Chambers. One instance of altered opinion is characteristic. In 1910 he brought forward an explanation of the "bad" Quarto of "The Merry Wives of Windsor": "Greg has shown," I quote from Chambers's standard "William Shakespeare" (1930), "that in 'Merry Wives' the reporter was almost certainly an actor who played the Host, and reconstructed the play from memory." This view has hardly been challenged, and it has been very influential in studies of the other "bad" Quartos. Greg, however, a man difficult to satisfy, now says, "I formerly suggested that the report was made by the actor of this part. It may be so, but there are difficulties"; and after packing the difficulties into a sentence, "Perhaps it would be safer to assume an independent reporter relying generally on mine Host's assistance." In the substantial agreement of Greg and Chambers, by the way, where they have handled the same subject, can be found a handsome index to the reliability of modern textual scholarship.

The fifty pages of Prolegomena to this volume, On Editing Shakespeare, can scarcely be discussed here, but I may record my opinion that, of proposals at all similar which I have read (all, I think, now generally held to have significance beyond their immediate objects), none will sustain comparison, for justice and fulness, with these. Although they are offered by Greg as an "interpretation and development" of McKerrow's "Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare" (published in 1939 shortly before his death), and are phrased throughout with Greg's habitual modesty, they in fact correct the rigidly conservative proposals of McKerrow in very important respects, amplify them in others, and break new ground at half a dozen points. Greg's experience and insight have never been better employed. The certainty that no critical edition of Shakespeare can be undertaken in the future without reference to these Prolegomena sharpens one's regret that Dr. Greg has not himself been given an opportunity to edit the plays; perhaps no one else, in the long history of Shakespearean study, has been so well equipped. We might have got that phoenix, a sound and standard text,

JOHN BERRYMAN

RESORT



OPEN UNTIL SEPTEMBER 25th

PROGRESSIVE SCHOOL

HESSIAN HILLS SCHOOL

Day and Boarding School for Boys and Girls.

School staffed to meet the individual and group needs of children from two to fourteen years of age. Excellent facilities. Well planned program. Expanded Boarding Department.

Frances R. Horwich, Ph.D., Educational Dir.

Croton-on-Hudson, New York—50 min. from New York City

AMUSEMENTS

"COLORFUL AND FAST-MOVING" — Brown, Sun
 RICHARD KOLLMAR Presents A NEW MUSICAL COMEDY

EARLY TO BED

MURIEL
ANGELUSRICHARD
KOLLMARMARY
SMALLBOB
HOWARD

Book & Lyrics by GEORGE MARION, Jr. • Music by THOMAS (FATS) WALLER
 44th St. W. of B'way—Air Conditioned
 BROADHURST Theatre, Evgs. at 8:30, Matinees Wed. & Sat., at 2:30

FOR
YOUR
CONVENIENCE

THE NATION

55 Fifth Avenue

New York 3, N. Y.

NOTICE OF
CHANGE
OF ADDRESS

Nation subscribers should give us at least three weeks' notice of a change of address, indicating the old as well as the new address.

Please enter my subscription to your magazine.

☐ 1 Year \$5 ☐ 2 Years \$8 ☐ 3 Years \$11☐ Introductory Offer: 13 Weeks for \$1☐ Remittance is inclosed

Canada \$1 a year extra

Foreign \$1 a year extra

Pan American Union requires no extra postage

NAME

ADDRESS

.....

8-21-43

Fiction in Review

ALTHOUGH John P. Marquand's "So Little Time" (Little, Brown, \$2.75) is his best novel to date and the most interesting coming-of-the-war novel I have read, there is a disconcerting discrepancy between the quality of its first two-thirds and its last third. It is not only that the last 200 pages are tedious in themselves; they cast a dark shadow over the freshness and charm of the 400 pages that precede them, making it difficult to recapture the original glow.

For instance, if I had written this review before I had to take into account the effect of Mr. Marquand's book as a whole, I should have liked to use its simplicity and relaxation and visuality as an object lesson for all earnest young writers who think of fiction as a form of intellectual exhibitionism; certainly it is not the conscious intellect but creative energy that writes a novel, and for a good stretch of the way "So Little Time" is a fine lesson in naturalness. But then Mr. Marquand spoils my case for me; or rather, he puts me in the unhappy position of having to switch from my author-as-model to my author-as-bad-example. For in the last 200 pages, when creative energy fails Mr. Marquand and nothing is left but a mind at work, one could indeed wish that his thought processes were more stimulating. Or I should have liked to say of "So Little Time," before I had gone its full length, that here was fiction which, in contrast to the over-formulation of so many current novels, effectively makes its point by simply never making its point—were it not that the tediousness of the last section of Mr. Marquand's book must surely result in large part from his effort to point up the meaning of a novel whose meaning was never particularly in question until he undertook the job of clarification.

In the sense in which "The Late George Apley" was a novel "about" Boston, "So Little Time" is not a novel about anything. Very loosely constructed and ranging over twenty-five years of time, it is the emotional history of a man who fought in the last war and who has a son just the right age to fight in this war. Mr. Marquand's hero, middle-aged in 1940-41, wants to know what his life adds up to in the light of the fact that his son is about to have to fight—this is the serious point of departure for Mr. Marquand's novel, but actually what makes the story interesting is Jeff Wilson's success as a play-doctor and movie-writer and his position in society, which allows Mr. Marquand to roam, with the freedom that only money can buy, over such a wonderful variety of places, from theater rehearsals to Park Avenue apartments, from Massachusetts to Hollywood to Washington to suburban Connecticut, exhibiting to excellent advantage his limited but very shrewd talents for observation and satire. The important relations between characters in "So Little

Time" may always be a matter of confusion and one may be forced to conclude that its author is novelistically comfortable only with what has actually met his eye, but Mr. Marquand's novel is full of wonderful satiric set pieces, including people, such as the description of the Connecticut home of a young middle-aged couple who live on tax-exempt bonds, or the description of lunch at an exclusive club, or the description of a publisher's cocktail party, or Mr. Marquand's own clean version of a Hollywood script conference. And there is an account of the changes that the years have brought to the Boston Post Road which is better than the best of Mr. Marquand's satire, as well as one scene, at a private riding lesson, which rises so far above his usual level of vision as to achieve something reminiscent of greatness.

Of course, even so early in the game Mr. Marquand is not the first novelist to use the outbreak of the war as the precipitating or resolving agent for the casting up of an individual's score. But at least one thing that distinguishes "So Little Time" from a novel like, say, Michael Blankfort's "A Time to Live" is its refusal to treat a world-wide catastrophe as if it had been especially devised to accomplish the author's personal salvation—and all on the highest moral and intellectual grounds. I find it a crude relief that Mr. Marquand's hero, veteran of the last war, hates the idea of a new war because he loves his son and fears for his safety but still can envy the boy the adventure of war and himself wish to enlist again for no higher reason than that it might help him recapture his lost youth. "So Little Time" obviously misses the stature of tragedy because its chief characters lack stature, and yet, if only because it stays with the individual in his full commonplaceness and without the trappings of cosmic virtue, it achieves some small measure of tragic import. And paradoxically, despite its limitations, it becomes a valid social document exactly because it is not intended to be a social document.

I may be mistaken in thinking that "A Man of Malice Landing" by Dorothy James Roberts (Macmillan, \$2.50), being written by a woman, should have had a woman for its protagonist. It is not that I think women novelists incapable of creating male heroes. But I was constantly struck, in Miss Roberts's account of the education of Marius Robinson and especially in the major sections which deal with Marius's return to Malice Landing (Ohio), by how much more accurately it seemed to trace the emotional pattern of a certain kind of self-conscious, "sensitive" woman than that of her male counterpart. Miss Roberts writes with taste, education, and directness, and she has a nice point of departure for a novel—not that I put much stock in points of departure for novels—in the notion of a man who leaves his small town to make his way in the big city and then, when he returns, discovers that any cross-roads may be the world but that his own small town is too small a world and that he still prefers the big city. It is a nice double turn on the current sentimentality about life and freedom and self-fulfillment being all a matter of discovering the gold in the heart of your rural neighbors. Still, I prefer fiction which projects itself either through bigger people than Marius Robinson or over a more complex canvas than Miss Roberts has attempted.

DIANA TRILLING

Buy Your Books Through The Nation

At the request of many readers who reside in communities in which no bookshop has been established, *The Nation* offers to deliver any book to your door at the regular publisher's price (post free) provided payment is received with the order, or publisher's price plus postage if sent C. O. D.

Readers' Service Division

The Nation • 55 Fifth Avenue • New York

MUSIC

TOSCANINI'S July broadcast of another Verdi program offered a number of familiar pieces—*O don fatale* from "Don Carlos," *Pace, pace, mio dio* from "La Forza del Destino," *Eri tu* from "Un Ballo in Maschera," the entire last act of "Rigoletto" with its famous quartet—in performances which molded and integrated vocal line and orchestral context in a style that made their dramatic expressiveness and power breath-taking. These performances made it especially fascinating to follow the course of each piece—the powerful introductory passage and accompaniment figure of the orchestra, the beautiful and expressive melodic line of the voice, the single woodwind joining the voice at a salient point in this line, the other wind instruments entering to create a texture around the voice in its further progress (these instrumental counterpoints were things one heard in the studio but not over the air, where microphone placement caused them to be blanketed by the voices). Following in this way one was aware of magnificent pieces of dramatic music taking shape in those arias, that final act, that quartet; and one marveled again and again at the evidence of Verdi's feeling for his medium, his skill and taste in its use, in the service of the dramatic situation.

Of the singers two were already well known—Jan Peerce, who has a beautiful tenor voice, and whose authenticity of style includes the tenor sob; and the young baritone Alfredo Valentino, whose singing has a fine sonority and authority. And two were young newcomers—Ann Merriman, with a superb contralto voice which she has under technical control and employs with good musical understanding; and Gertrude Ribla, with a beautiful soprano which—to judge from occasional unsteadiness and tremolo and stridency—she uses with imperfect and insecure method of production, and which she will harm if she continues to sing without learning how.

Webster Aitken's performance of Beethoven's Diabelli Variations at a Frick Collection summer concert proved to be one of the great events of the year. The performance at his debut about seven years ago left one astonished by the manifestations of maturity in the playing of so young a man; but this time one was even more astonished by the evidence of greater maturity of understanding and emotion in a performance at once more expansive and more

integrated—by this in combination with the youthful verve that manifested itself right at the start in the rhythmic incisiveness, the buoyancy, the glints of humor in the statement of Diabelli's waltz. At a later Frick Collection concert the same expansive and integrating shaping produced a magnificently powerful statement of the first movement of Schubert's Sonata Op. 78; and while I do not share Aitken's conception of the subsequent movements—I feel them to be easy-going and relaxed, which he does not—I enjoyed the superb things he made of them in accordance with his own conception, especially the verve, the strength, the humor that he put into the last movement. At this second concert he also played a number of pieces by Debussy; and as one of those who used to think of Gieseking's miraculously achieved pastels as the last word in Debussy performance I was amazed again to hear how much more Aitken's imagination discovered in those pieces and conveyed through his more robust and rich-sounding sonorities. And these were pieces and performances which demonstrated his superb mastery of his instrument. As our musical life is organized his playing may be heard by a handful of people at the Frick Collection, but it is nevertheless among the greatest there is to be heard.

Victor has issued a set (943, \$5.50) of D'Indy's Symphony No. 2 in B flat Op. 57, performed by Monteux with the San Francisco Symphony; and Victor's press division has been kind enough to send with it the set (913, \$3.50) of D'Indy's Symphony on a French Mountain Air Op. 25, performed by Monteux with the same orchestra and the pianist Maxim Schapiro, which failed to reach me when it was issued about a year ago.

The Symphony No. 2 begins with germinal motifs, out of which come the themes of the movements; and cyclical unity is achieved further by the recurrence in later movements of themes from earlier movements. But from the first germinal motif to the last grand combination of themes it is an arbitrary, mechanical progression unmotivated and unmitigated by a grain of genuine poetic impulse or creative talent, producing in the end a mere illustration for D'Indy's "Cours de Composition Musicale" and one of the dullest, dreariest, and most unattractive pieces of music I have ever heard. The performance seems good; its recorded sound is excellent; surfaces range from fair to poor.

The earlier symphony has the advan-

tage of being made out of the French mountain air and other tuneful themes which work out less elaborately into a more engaging work—though it is not one that I care much about. The performance seems good; its recorded sound is excellent; surfaces range from fair to poor; and a few sides of my copy waver in pitch.

B. H. HAGGIN

CONTRIBUTORS

DONALD W. MITCHELL, professor of political science at Sam Houston State Teachers College in Texas, is at work on a history of the United States Navy since 1883, for which he won a \$1,250 literary fellowship from Alfred A. Knopf.

DR. REINHOLD NIEBUHR is a professor at Union Theological Seminary, chairman of the Union for Democratic Action, and a contributing editor of *The Nation*. He returned last month from a long stay in England.

JEROME WEINSTEIN, a New York lawyer, has written on taxes and fiscal policy for *The Nation*, *Taxes*, and other magazines. His proposal for controlled inflation, first set forth in the New York *Herald Tribune*, was subsequently discussed by Keith Hutchison in *The Nation*.

LOUIS GRABER is the pseudonym of a well-known European political writer and journalist who is now in this country. For personal reasons he prefers to remain anonymous.

PAUL WINKLER is a French journalist now living in this country. He is the author of "The Thousand-Year Conspiracy."

ALEXANDER UHL is foreign-affairs editor of *PM*.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES has appeared in many magazines as poet and critic. He is the author of two books of verse, "Europa and Other Poems" and "Out of the Jewel," and was co-editor of the Spanish Loyalist anthology, "And Spain Sings."

JOHN BERRYMAN, until recently an instructor at Harvard, was Charles Oldham Shakespeare Scholar at Cambridge University in 1937-38.

Letters to the Editors

Why the Secrecy?

Dear Sirs: May I suggest that your magazine criticize the secrecy and lack of democracy with which our government is handling the Italian affair?

Must Americans hear, via the German radio, the terms offered to Italy through a puppet ruler disguised as the people's choice, when actually he is as much a Fascist as Mussolini? (What went wrong with that coup d'état anyway? It didn't pan out the way it was intended.) America's honor is at stake. It can be redeemed, if we offer to negotiate openly and honestly with a chosen representative of the Italian people on the basis of the Atlantic Charter.

The Italian people do not relish another dictatorship backed by our Gauleiters. They want an opportunity to choose their own government, and if we as a nation act nobly and generously with these people we can expect an early peace in Europe. Other people will be impressed by our fairness, and they will force their dictators to abdicate so that they too can have an honorable peace.

Can it be we have lost sight of our objective, as is so often the case when nations become drunk with power? Peace and a return to civilization should be our only aims. We do not wish to rule, and we did not accept the war on those terms.

All eyes are upon us now. We cannot afford to go back on our promise.

JO CANTINI

Woodstock, N. Y., August 3

What Soldiers Think About

Dear Sirs: I read with interest the letter of Ellsworth Barnard, in your issue of July 3, on the subject of history—and education in general—in our high schools. To my mind most of his contentions are definitely valid, and his letter is all the more important because it touches the root of the entire matter.

However, I was particularly interested in one aspect of his presentation, namely, his account of Drew Middleton's report in the *Times Magazine*. Although I did not read the full report, the small part of it which I did read (in Mr. Barnard's letter) echoed some of my own observations and opinions, gathered in my year of service in the

United States Army. Mr. Middleton is one of the very few commentators or correspondents from whom I have heard any comment upon this question. Vague antipathy, vague benevolence, indeed! Vagueness, in fact, sums up the entire attitude of the large majority of our soldiers of democracy. Hardly a thought, or at least no expression of that thought if such exists, is given to any sort of political or social problem that the world faces—and that includes our own country.

Where such expression does come to the fore, it usually displays prejudice, ignorance of facts (with very blasé, impersonal overtones), cynicism, smugness, and an utter lack of understanding as to the basic issues of the war. Post-war peace conferences, post-war planning, reconstruction, adjustment to an America that will not be as they left it—these and other equally important questions are rarely subject matter for an evening's discussion. Opinions (prejudices, more accurately) do exist, to be sure.

Common among them are: "Watch out for Russia after this war." "Beat the Japs first and then forget about the other side, since Britain would do the same." "Our kids will have to fight another war in twenty or so years, so what does it matter?" "This war will end when the big shots have made enough money on both sides." "If we had kept our noses clean we wouldn't have been in this in the first place." Etc., etc., ad infinitum, ad nauseam. Any thirst for discussion is fulfilled by long, pornographic "bull sessions," devoted chiefly to sexual matters, merits and effects of one type of inebriation as compared to another, and other intellectual food on a similar plane. Middleton very succinctly summed up the "intellectual curiosity" of our soldiers with regard to the comic strip and sports pages. In our barracks, which has quite a fair-sized number of men, I know of but one interested enough in political and social matters to read anything more progressive or politically mature than *Life* magazine, a sad commentary on the state of mind of the men fighting to build a better world.

It is very distressing, to say the least, that of our hundreds of war correspondents, news commentators, and reporters,

only a handful have seen fit to comment upon this unfortunate situation, one with which most of them are surely acquainted. Perhaps it is better for civilian morale to leave such things unsaid, perhaps it is consciously blinding ourselves to a damnable situation, but surely this blot is of enough importance to warrant public discussion, the better to cope with the problem, the better to preclude its assertion in the future. Instead, our correspondents write of how Jim Smith of Main Street, Hicksville, Ohio, has conquered the water problem in his outfit (verily, a tribute to American ingenuity), or how John Doe has impressed the natives of Africa (a forward step, no doubt, in international relations). Yes, the folks at home want that stuff, but how about telling them some of the more important truths, even if it does hurt?

A noted American thinker and editor wrote, from London, that our troops were equipped with obsolete psychological equipment, particularly in comparison with that of some of our Allies. He stated it inaccurately. Our troops are equipped with *no* psychological equipment; only with a superficial understanding of the issues involved, expressed in "Let's get this damn thing over with so that we can go home and back to normal." Agreed, Mr. Barnard, "this is the result of our boasted system of education."

PFC E. W.

Somewhere in Canada, July 29

They Want Books

Dear Sirs: Out in the swirling sand storms, dust, and terrible heat of the Middle East, Sicily, and the Mediterranean coast, British soldiers and sailors, with our men and Canadian and Australian troops, are sweating and bleeding and dying that the cause of freedom may live. We here at home, many with our sons, husbands, brothers, sisters, and sweethearts in the armed forces, follow the struggle day by day, hour by hour, doing what we can to help in the battle for humanity. Either we are engaged in war work or we take a hand in civilian defense or in one of the agencies which give aid to our fighting men here and abroad. We buy bonds or grow victory gardens or help in other ways.

There is one important way, though,

in which we can do our part to make life easier for the boys who are facing the enemy, and that is by sending them books and magazines. When these men have a few moments of rest and respite they want something to read. Thousands of books and magazines have already gone to them, but the need grows.

The British War Relief Society, a member agency in the National War Fund, is endeavoring to help meet this need. In the past it has confined its appeal to New York City, where the response has been so gratifying that the campaign is now being broadened to cover the whole nation.

The society forwards the books and, from the many appreciative responses already received, the Book Committee of the B. W. R. S. knows that they are read and read again until they are worn to tatters. Novels, detective and mystery stories, and romances are much in demand. Pocket-size books are particularly desirable.

We should be grateful if your readers would send books and magazines, quickly, to the nearest headquarters of the British War Relief Society. (Its New York address is 745 Fifth Avenue, fifth floor.) The sooner they are in our hands the sooner they will reach the men overseas.

WINIFRED BARUCH,

Book Committee Chairman,
British War Relief Society

New York City, August 5

Not Exempt

Dear Sirs: In the interesting, well-written article Advertise for Victory, which appeared some time ago in *The Nation*, there occurred the phrase "... since advertisements aiding the war-bond drive are tax-exempt." This statement is not literally correct.

The author doubtless meant that an expenditure made for such advertising is deductible as an expense under the income-tax law. However, even this version would not be correct as an invariable Treasury Department rule. In other words, there is extant no formal ruling by the Internal Revenue Bureau, as far as I know, differentiating war-bond advertising from all other advertising and giving it blanket tax deductibility.

WILLIAM G. COBB

New York, July 1

Right

Dear Sirs: I think you will find the true reading will be: "The right of self-determination for all the right people."

JOHN BUCHANAN

Berwick, Nova Scotia, July 31

RESORTS

For Complete Enjoyment & Relaxation



Come to
**CAMP
COLEBROOK**
Colebrook River, Conn.
(Formerly an exclusive
Country Club)

• Private Lake surrounded by 300 acres of pines and hemlocks • Cozy bungalows, woodburning fireplaces • Tennis, Handball, Pingpong, Water Sports • Dancing, Recordings.
• Special Discount to Men & Women in Uniform
RATES: \$35-\$37.50 Phone AL 4-0063
Greyhound Bus stops at Colebrook River
New Haven Train stops at Winsted, Connecticut

CHI-WAN-DA
ON THE HUDSON

ULSTER PARK, N. Y. Phone Kingston 1329
On the Mountain Lake Esopus, overlooking the beautiful Hudson River. Social staff, dancing, all water & land sports. Fine cuisine, most modern improvements.
Directions:—Train - Bus - Boat to Kingston
Attractive Rates
J. I. DOROSHKIN, Director, 545 Fifth Avenue
MU 2-4217 PR 8-6610

ADDITIONAL
RESORT ADVERTISING
On Page 219 and Inside Back Cover

Your Kind of Customers!

There are almost 34,000 readers of *The Nation* doing what you are doing—reading this advertisement. If you have something of interest to offer them—call *The Nation Advertising Department* for particulars as to space, cost and closing date of the next issue.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING RATES:

62c a line (six words)

Minimum 3 lines

\$6.16 an inch

THE Nation

55 Fifth Ave., New York 3, N. Y.

ALgonquin 4-3311

LANGUAGES

**PREPARE NOW for
POST-WAR
OPPORTUNITIES
with LINGUAPHONE**

In your own home you can now prepare for peace-time opportunities in many fields by learning to speak in an amazingly short time any of 29 languages by the world-famous

LINGUAPHONE Ear-Eye METHOD

It's quick, easy, correct

SPANISH	JAPANESE	RUSSIAN
PORTUGUESE	FRENCH	GERMAN
ITALIAN	CHINESE	NORWEGIAN

and 20 others.

Successfully used by Army, Navy, Flying and Signal Corps and other services; in thousands of schools and colleges; endorsed by leading educators.

Send for FREE Book—

Call for FREE Demonstration

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
3 RCA Bldg., Rockefeller Plaza, N. Y. (20)

WANTED TO PURCHASE

LINGUAPHONE. Any language. Indicate condition, number of records and books. LANGUAGE, Room 1203, 18 E. 41st St., N. Y. C.

HEALTH FOODS

SPECIAL OFFER

Raw Peanut Butter: 40¢ 1 lb; 78¢ 2 lb; \$1.50 4 lb
1st Pressing Unadulterated Grape Juice: \$1.60 Gal. (12 points)

Papaya: 95¢ Qt., \$2.95 Gal.

Unadulterated Apple Juice: 90¢ Gal.

Above juices suitable for all diets. Postage or express extra.

Write for our new Price List on Pure Health Foods

LISS HEALTH FOOD CENTER

3300 North Ave. Chicago, Ill.

FOR RENT

BROOKLYN HEIGHTS: Convenient, 2½ rooms, kitchenette, bath, fireplace, refrigeration, cross ventilation. \$45. Single; business couple desired. MA 5-1281.

IMPORTANT NOTICE to Nation Subscribers!

Moving? Make sure your weekly copies of *The Nation* go with you!

☞ Please give us at least three weeks' advance notice of a change of address.

☞ In your notification, please indicate your old address, and the new one as well.

Your cooperation will help us to avoid any delay and insure prompt service.

THE Nation

FIFTY-FIVE FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

